

The Past is Prologue

Supplements
to
Vigiliae Christianae

Formerly Philosophy Patrum

Texts and Studies of Early
Christian Life and Language

Editors

J. den Boeft—J. van Oort—W.L. Petersen
D.T. Runia—C. Scholten—J.C.M. van Winden

VOLUME 75

The Past is Prologue

The Revolution of Nicene Historiography

by

Thomas C. Ferguson



BRILL
LEIDEN • BOSTON
2005

In some cases it has not been possible, despite our effort, to locate those with rights to material that may still be in copyright. The publisher would be glad to hear from anyone who holds such rights, in order that appropriate acknowledgement can be made in future editions.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Ferguson, Thomas C.

The past is prologue : the revolution of Nicene historiography / by Thomas C. Ferguson.

p. cm. — (Supplements to Vigilia Christianae, ISSN 0920-623X ; v. 75)
Originally presented as the author's thesis (doctoral) — Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 2002.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 90-04-14457-9 (alk. paper)

1. Theology, Doctrinal—History—Early church, ca. 30–600—Historiography. 2. Heresies, Christian—History—Early church, ca. 30–600—Historiography. 3. Church history—Primitive and early church, ca. 30–600—Historiography. I. Title. II. Series.

BT25.F47 2005

270.1'072—dc22

2005045743

ISSN 0920-623X
ISBN 90 04 14457 9

© Copyright 2005 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill Academic
Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Chapter One: Introduction: The Beginning of the End of the “Arian” Controversy	1
Chapter Two: The Eusebian Prelude: Be True to Your School	15
I Introduction	15
II Defending the School of Caesarea: Books 6 and 7 of the <i>Ecclesiastical History</i>	22
III Book X of the <i>Ecclesiastical History</i> : History through the Lens of Origen	35
IV The Council of Nicaea in <i>The Life of Constantine</i>	47
Chapter Three: The <i>Chronicon Paschale</i> and non-Nicene Historiography	57
I Introduction: Athanasius and the Eusebian Paradigm	57
II The Anonymous “Arian” Chronicler and the School of Lucian	62
III Reassessment of Constantius in the <i>Chronicon Paschale</i>	74
IV Conclusion	78
Chapter Four: Rufinus of Aquileia and the Beginnings of Nicene Historiography	81
I Introduction	81
II Rufinus and the Continuation of Eusebius	86
III Role of the Imperium in the “Arian” Controversy	92
IV Fractured Chronology in the Death of Constantine and Portrayal of Constantius	96
V The Making of a Holy Man: Athanasius in Rufinus	104
VI Role of the Monk-Bishop in Rufinus	112
VII Conclusion	121

Chapter 5: Other Voices, Other Rooms: The <i>Ecclesiastical History</i> of Philostorgius	125
I Introduction	125
II Be True to Your School, Part II: The Lucianic Traditions in Philostorgius	132
III The Anonymous Presbyter Revisited: Philostorgius' Construction of Imperial Authority	139
IV The Making of Holy Men: Aetius, Eunomius, and Doctrinal Purity	152
V Conclusion	163
Chapter Six: Conclusion: the Revolution of Nicene Historiography	165
Bibliography	171
Appendix: Fragments from a Non-Nicene Chronicler; Introduction to the Text	179
Index	223

I smashed a camera
I want to know why
To my eye
Deciding
Which lies that I've been hiding
Which echoes belong
I'm counting on
A heart I know by heart
To walk me through this war
Where memories distort
—Jeff Tweedy, *Kamera*

PREFACE

Eight years ago when I casually said to a friend that I was starting a doctoral program in history, he remarked, “You know, as Harry Truman said, ‘History is more or less bunk.’ Why would you want to spend your time studying that?” I replied that my friend had entered into highly ironic territory, since it was Henry Ford, not Harry Truman, who supplied that quote, and thus my friend had just added to the accumulated so-called “bunk” of history. Justifying his own nihilistic lifestyle by denigrating the study of history, it would seem, was more important to my friend than actually getting the facts straight. This dissertation is in some ways an expansion of that interchange: for the church historians of the fourth and fifth centuries, is getting the facts straight more important than making a point?

This book is a revised version of my doctoral dissertation presented in 2002 to the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California. The basic premise of my dissertation was that the church histories written in the fourth and fifth century need to be liberated from modern standards of historiography. History, for the ancients, was not the objective recounting of events (for that matter, neither is any telling of history). To fault church historians for “errors” in their chronologies, or to accuse of them of being biased or one-sided, seemed to me to be introducing a category or standard which would have been hopelessly foreign to a pre-Enlightenment world view. Rather, I argue that church histories need not be secondary

players in the development of Christian doctrine, used to date councils and track the movements of major figures, but instead need to be taken on the same level as more preferred texts in studying the history of Christian thought—doctrinal treatises, letters written by the main players, and Scriptural commentaries.

My initial idea for this dissertation dates back fifteen years to my Introduction to the New Testament class at Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut. Rather than march us through the various books of the New Testament, the professor chose to focus on only four—the Gospel of Mark, the Letter to the Corinthians, the Letter to the Galatians, and the Book of Revelation—and to present the most recent cutting-edge (at that time) historical scholarship on each book. This was the class that convinced me to give up my boyhood dreams of writing the great American novel and instead become a religious studies major. We examined how these texts functioned on a variety of literary, cultural, religious, and social levels. In our study of the Gospel of Mark, we looked at Burton Mack's then-recently published *Myth of Innocence: the Gospel of Mark and Christian Origins*.¹ To this day I marvel at the bold attempt our professor made to introduce freshmen and sophomores to advanced biblical criticism! Mack's thesis was that on one level the core sources of the Gospel of Mark functioned as a “myth of origins”, written by certain followers of Jesus. The Gospel later attributed to Mark was certainly not a biography, or an attempt recount everything Jesus said or taught. Thus while it may be interesting to note how it differs from the other Gospels, for Mack what was important was how Mark's gospel provided a narrative of community identity for a particular group of Jesus' followers. This dissertation is an extension of Mack's thesis to fourth-century Christianity. Eusebius of Caesarea, author of the first extant, comprehensive history of the Christian church, was certainly not attempting to provide a full and complete narrative of the development of Christianity. Rather, for his school of Caesarea, loyal to the teachers Pamphilus and Origen, the *Ecclesiastical History* was as much a narrative of community identity, or myth of origins, as Mark's gospel. Rufinus, writing the first extant continuation of Eusebius nearly a century later, is doing much the

¹ Burton Mack, *Myth of Innocence: the Gospel of Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).

same, albeit from a different world view: living in a Christian Empire in the Latin-speaking west, profoundly influenced by Athanasius and the burgeoning monastic movement, as well as Origen.

In the course of completing my undergraduate and master's level studies, I moved from New Testament and Christian origins to focusing on the early church. Specifically, my interests were in the development of Christian doctrine, of the interplay between "heresy" and "orthodoxy." I learned to doubt the relevance or usefulness of such categories, as the inverted commas soberly indicate. History was certainly not "bunk." History was an extraordinarily complex interweaving of many different factors. Contrary to Mr. Ford's dictum, I discovered in my studies that if anything was "bunk" it was simplistic catchphrases such as his own, as well as oversimplified categories such as "heresy" and "orthodoxy." Indeed, casually using such words over a thousand years removed from the theological disputes of a previous era seemed once again to fail to take into account the complexity of the ancient world view and to impose categories anachronistically. We need no clearer example than poor Origen, who had the misfortune of being condemned as a heretic three hundred years after his death for holding opinions which were more or less acceptable during his lifetime. His condemnation needed to wait until language was refined to such a degree that certain aspects of his theological systems could be deemed as "heretical" and an appropriate enforcement measure—an "ecumenical" council—had been developed.

Yet in studying "heretics" I often encountered another phenomenon. This was the penchant of some to move exactly in the opposite direction of the formalized categories of "heresy" and "orthodoxy" and to privilege those who had been marginalized as heretics. Works have abounded which seem to portray those condemned in the writings of the "orthodox" church fathers as counter-cultural icons struggling against the soulless system the church was becoming. For example, portraying Irenaeus as a heavy-handed figure of authority single-mindedly opposed to carefree Gnostics who only sought freedom of expression is surely as short-sighted as accepting without question that Arius was a motivated at best by vanity and at worst by demonic possession. Blaming Constantine for corrupting Christianity most certainly may allow certain authors to sell more copies of their novels, yet such popular characterizations that now abound often are about as accurate a representation of the development of "heresy"

and “orthodoxy” as Franz Kafka’s *The Metamorphosis* is an accurate representation of the life of a cockroach.

Thus a second premise of this book is based on another work read as an undergraduate at Wesleyan University, Jonathan Z. Smith’s *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*,² originally a series of lectures given in 1988 at the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London. As the title indicates, Smith discusses the nature of comparison in scholarly discourse. Essential to Smith’s argument is that comparison necessarily involves a third “thing,” the *tertium quid*.³ In the study of the development of doctrine in the fourth century⁴ “heresy” is often used as a *tertium quid*. There are the current (i.e., at the time he is writing a particular author assumes what is believed is and has always been “orthodox”) perceptions of what constitutes Christian orthodoxy; there was a period of testing and development in the early church; and the “heretics” were the necessary *tertium quid* by which Christianity figured out what was acceptable and what was not, or so goes many a history of Christianity’s early centuries. The danger is letting any one of these three elements necessary in any process of comparison become a cipher for interpretation to the exclusion of the others. Assuming that the “heretics” were really the ones who were orthodox is to privilege the *tertium quid* and in reality exhibits one of the greatest dangers in the process of comparison: reading back into the past one’s own contemporary situation and one’s own prejudices.

Avoiding this danger is one of the reasons why there is no attempt in this book to decisively settle the vexing question as to why (neo) Nicene Orthodoxy eventually prevailed over varying interpretations of the nature of the second person of the Trinity. I have consciously chosen not to provide any sweeping, definitive statements in my conclusion, and have done so for specific reasons. This is not because I do not have strongly held opinions on the matter. Indeed, a short

² Jonathan Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

³ See, for example, Smith, 51: “the statement of comparison is never dyadic, but always triadic . . .” Likewise in his discussion of the work of Charles Dupuis, Smith notes that “there is always a third term to his comparisons (Smith, 33).”

⁴ Note the conscious avoidance of the terminology of an “Arian” controversy; for more on this, see the Introduction.

conversation with my wife will reveal I have any number of strongly held opinions on a variety of matters, the eventual predominance of (neo) Nicene Orthodoxy being one of them, and she usually patiently listens to them. I chose not to provide a more conclusive conclusion for two reasons. First of all it would have made my dissertation significantly longer, and I always believe that the best dissertation is a finished one. I knew too many struggling graduate students whose Quixotic pursuits of proving their grand theories only resulted in them dropping out and becoming bitter Starbucks baristas, dissertations forever unfinished.

The second and more important is that I fear any attempt to provide a sweeping conclusion would do an extraordinary disservice to the complex interaction of religious, social, political, economic, and cultural factors that influenced the development of doctrine in the fourth century.⁵ In addition I fear any such attempt would in the end say more about the author as a white, liberal, Western Episcopalian writing at the turn of the twenty-first century than it would say about a monastic bishop writing in Caesarea in the fourth century. Woe unto me if I become like the author cited by J.Z. Smith, who in rejecting the notion that “orthodox” Christians borrowed from “pagans” or “Gnostics” concluded that, “In apostolic times, we have a full description of the services in Corinth, and they remind you of a modern prayer meeting or an old-fashioned Methodist class meeting.”⁶ The author Smith cites, needless to say, is a Methodist. Or, as Jeff Tweedy noted in his poem “Kamera,” if one holds a camera up to a distorted memory, one gets not an image of reality, but really an image of one’s own distortions.

This work, then, is meant to complement recent scholarly work in the development of doctrine. I am particularly indebted to the work of Maurice Wiles, R.P.C. Hanson, Rebecca Lyman, and Richard Vaggione, among others. In this book I hope to provide yet another filter through which to sift the complex phenomena which came together in the fourth century. The title itself indicates this. I am indebted to the work of Richard Vaggione, particularly his *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*. Dr. Vaggione has demonstrated the

⁵ As Smith summarizes, “The traditional vague terminology of ‘Early Christianity,’ ‘Gentile,’ ‘Pagan,’ ‘Greco-Oriental,’ etc., will not suffice. Each of these generic terms denote complex plural phenomena (Smith, 117).”

⁶ Smith, 45.

remarkable diversity of theological expression in the fourth century. This work is in part an attempt to add the revolution in Nicene and non-Nicene historiography to the impressive work of recent decades in the development of doctrine. But we also need more work done in social prosopography, economic history, and several others areas of academic inquiry before attempting to explain the predominance of (neo) Nicene Orthodoxy. The fourth and fifth centuries witnesses many literary and cultural revolutions.

This book would not have been possible without assistance, both physical and spiritual, of many people. Søren Kierkegaard wrote that in love, everyone starts from the beginning. In a similar fashion, one could not produce a work of this nature or complete a doctoral degree without building upon many first beginnings. I am particularly grateful to Rabbi Roger Klein and Professor Ron Cameron of Wesleyan University, both of whom instilled in me as an undergraduate a passion for reading and analyzing texts. I would also like to thank the Rev. Dr. Rowan A. Greer of Yale Divinity School for introducing me to the study of Patristics when I was having second thoughts about pursuing doctoral work in biblical studies. Studying first with Rabbi Klein and Professor Cameron, then with Professor Greer (whose doctoral work was in New Testament), helped to bridge the academic distinction in religious studies between people who study “New Testament” and people who study “Church History.” This artificial distinction is perhaps why no one has applied concepts from New Testament/Christian origins to the fourth century as of yet. At the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California, I owe particular thanks to Professor Jim Skedros from the Patriarch Athenagoras Orthodox Institute and to the Rev. Dr. Eugene Ludwig. In addition, the Rev. Dr. Richard Vaggione, OHC, at nearby Incarnation Priory was an invaluable resource. A Newhall Foundation grant allowed the two of us to study and translate the *Martyrdom of Artemius* and the *Vita* of Lucian of Antioch, in particular attempting to isolate possible fragments of non-Nicene hagiographic texts. A graduate seminar on Eusebius with Professor Susanna Elm from the University of California, Berkeley, gave me the initial idea for the dissertation upon which this book is based, and her expertise and advice have been greatly appreciated. Most importantly, I would like to thank the Rev. Dr. J. Rebecca Lyman at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific: mentor, teacher, scholar, colleague, and friend.

Apart from the academic communities of which I have been a part, I am indebted to the Rt. Rev. C. Christopher Epting in the Office of Ecumenical and Interfaith Relations of the Episcopal Church Center in New York City for the most welcome offer of employment, as well as for the support provided as I worked on finishing this manuscript.

To return to Kierkegaard, I could not have completed this work without the support of my wife, Shannon Kelly. I would also like to thank my parents, Francis and Barbara, who always understood and appreciated the value of education, and bypassed many pleasures for themselves to pay for books, tuition, and travel while I was in high school and college. Thanks are also due to my Basset hound Thor for his ministry of presence during long days of writing and to Jeff Tweedy for inspiration.

But most of all I would like to dedicate this to Evelyn Vradenburgh, my grandmother, who, unfortunately, did not live to witness the completion of my doctoral work. She was the first woman to head a denominational library, the Congregational Library in Boston, Massachusetts, where I spent many weekends and summer vacations roaming through the stacks. She nurtured me as a scholar by instilling in me a love of learning from the very beginning, and treasured books as wonders of God's creation.

Come gather round people, wherever you roam
And admit that the water around you has grown
And accept it or soon you'll be drenched to the bone
If your time to you is worth saving
You better start swimming or you'll sink like a stone
For *The times they are a-changin'*

—Bob Dylan

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: THE BEGINNING OF THE END OF THE “ARIAN” CONTROVERSY

The “Arian” Controversy as a hermeneutic for understanding the fourth century has become anachronistic. Recent scholarship has rendered this hermeneutic inviolable in two particular areas.¹ The first concerns the polemical creation of the term, the second the false dichotomy between “heresy” and “orthodoxy.”

¹ The last twenty years have seen a number of works deconstructing the “Arian” controversy. An important early article was Maurice Wiles’ “In Defence of Arius,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1963), 339–347. Robert Gregg and Dennis Groh’s “The Centrality of Soteriology in Early Arianism,” *Anglican Theological Review* 59 (1977) 260–278 and *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) were significant in examining the theology of Arius from a constructive element. Gregg and Groh argued that early Arianism presented a comprehensive soteriology based on Arius’ teaching concerning the nature of Christ. Roughly contemporaneously to Gregg and Groh, two other works also appeared: Thomas A. Kopecek’s *A History of Neo-Arianism* (Cambridge, MA: Philadelphia Patristics Foundation, 1979), tracing the theology of Aetius and Eunomius; and Rudolf Lorenz’ *Arius judaizans?: Untersuchungen zur dogmengeschichtlichen Einordnung des Arius* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980) examining possible influences from Judaism on the development of Arius’ theology. Two major works on the fourth century were produced towards the end of the 1980s: Rowan Williams’ *Arius, Heresy, and Tradition* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1987; second edition, 2001) and R.P.C. Hanson’s magisterial *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: the Arian Controversy 318–381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988). Williams’ work was essential in placing Arius within the context of the development of early fourth-century theology. Hanson’s work, as the title indicates, was broader in scope, and was fundamental in helping to recast the understanding of the development of doctrine. For a comparison and critique of Gregg and Groh, Williams, and Lorenz, see Richard Vaggione’s lengthy review article, “‘Arius, Heresy, and Tradition’ by Rowan Williams; also Gregg and Groh’s ‘Early Arianism,’ and Rudolph Lorenz’ ‘Arius judaizans?’,” *Toronto Journal of Theology*

First, scholarship has demonstrated the polemic creation of “Arianism.” Put simply, no contemporary in the fourth century was aware that an “Arian” controversy was engulfing the church. No one considered themselves “Arians” or even considered Arius the predominant figure in the debate. Rather the category of “Arian” was a creation of Athanasius of Alexandria to recast his struggles in the see of Alexandria and in the empire. Faced with a variety of disciplinary charges against him, it was Athanasius who argued that a group of supporters of the presbyter Arius were systematically attempting to unseat him from his see for doctrinal reasons. Linking himself with the Creed of Nicaea as his defense, in Athanasius Arius becomes the archetypal heretic. Both the “Arian” controversy and “Arian” as a group designation are the polemical creations of Athanasius. Nicaea and “Arianism” became polar opposites when in fact the theological landscape was much more complex.² There were persons opposed to Nicaea who would have nothing to do with Arius or his followers; likewise there were supporters of Nicaea who would have nothing to do with Athanasius.³ Not only is the “Arian” controversy not an accurate description of the theological climate of the fourth century, it was a polemical creation which became standardized in historical discourse.

In regards to the second point, previous assumptions assumed a body of doctrine which can be identified as “orthodox” from which one knowingly and purposely dissents.⁴ For centuries the “Arian”

5 (1989), 63–87. Two important collections of essays also appeared: *Arianism: Historical and Theological Assessments*, Robert Gregg, ed. (Cambridge, MA: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1985); and *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*, Michel Barnes and Daniel H. Williams, eds. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993). For a recent assessment of this time period and the theological issues involved, see Joseph Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth Century Theology* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2000). Richard Vaggione’s *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution* (New York: Oxford, 2001) has thoroughly re-examined the development of doctrine in the fourth century, focusing on the role of Aetius and Eunomius.

² See Timothy Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), and Maurice Wiles, “Attitudes to Arius in the Arian Controversy,” *Arianism After Arius*.

³ On the variety of parties within Nicene Christianity itself, see Vaggione, *Eunomius*, 315–317; Philip Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 97; and Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum*, 31–33.

⁴ For a recent attempt to synthesize how recent scholarship has produced a different historical paradigm for the fourth century, see Michel Barnes, “The Fourth Century as Trinitarian Canon,” in *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric, and Community*,

controversy was seen as the archetype of such a vision. The term tended to refer specifically to the reaction of Alexander of Alexandria to the teaching of one of his presbyters in the year 318. According to this paradigm, Arius questioned the fundamental tenet of the Christian faith, the divinity of Jesus, and because of influences ranging from Judaism, pagan philosophy, or even demonic control, contumaciously deviated from what had always been the church's teaching regarding the Trinity. The term "Arian" controversy, as developed in later historiography, tied the theological debates of the fourth century to the person of Arius and the events which emerged from the 318 confrontation. The furor surrounding Arius' teaching resulted in a council called by the Emperor Constantine at Nicaea in 325. The Creed of this Council eventually became the standard of orthodoxy championed by Athanasius of Alexandria, who was persecuted for his Nicene beliefs by followers of the presbyter Arius. The "Arian" controversy was then "solved" by the Council of Constantinople in 381, which added a fuller description of the Spirit to the Creed of 325 and refined Trinitarian theology by adopting the language of the Cappadocian fathers and describing the Godhead as three persons in one substance.⁵ After this "settlement" Arianism disappeared from the scene, remaining as remnants in "barbarian" tribes such as the Goths. Orthodoxy had triumphed against heresy, tradition against innovation, faithfulness to the received apostolic tradition as opposed to willful deviation. The only place that "Arianism" flourished was among groups external to the centers of Christendom. This was the accepted understanding of the fourth century into the second half of the twentieth century.⁶

Lewis Ayres and Gareth Jones, eds. (New York: Routledge, 1998), 47–67. See also Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum*, 28–46, which is essentially a reworking of his essay "The 'Arian' Controversy: Some Categories Reconsidered," *Theological Studies* 48 (1987), 415–437; see also *Orthodoxie, Christianisme, histoire* (Collection de l'École française de Rome, no. 270), Susanna Elm, Eric Rebillard, and Antonella Romano, eds. (Rome: École française, 2000) For work on the formation of the category of heresy in pre-Nicene Christianity, particularly the role of Justin and Irenaeus, see Alain Le Boulluec, *La Notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque, II^e–III^e siècles* (Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1985).

⁵ For a discussion of the Cappadocians in the "settlement," of 381, see Hanson, *Search*, 676–737; Anthony Meredith, *The Cappadocians* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995); and Jaroslav Pelikan, *Christianity and Classical Culture: the Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993).

⁶ For a summary of nineteenth and twentieth century historiography of the

The work of recent scholarship has done much to recast this image, though not entirely: as Rowan Williams noted, “We have come a fair way from the harsh polemic of Newman, though the shadow of Arianism-as-Other still haunts modern discussion.”⁷ Doctrine is now understood as having evolution and development. The rigidity of concepts of heresy and orthodoxy no longer are tenable. Furthermore, neither are historical categories which are predicated on them, such as the “Arian” controversy. The quest for the Christian doctrine of God is no longer seen as the maintenance of an unaltered apostolic faith in response to the teaching of a single presbyter and likeminded followers. Scholarship has demonstrated the diversity of theological opinion prior to the Council of Nicaea.⁸ Accepting the theological diversity inherent in the fourth century has necessitated rejecting facile labels which an “Arian” Controversy overlooks. A variety of works in the last decades have shown that the “Arian” controversy was not “Arian” at all, nor did the unfolding of the “controversy” resemble the church’s received historical narrative.⁹ Rather than operating within the constraints of “heresy” and “orthodoxy”, notions which privilege certain expressions of Christian theology over and against another, the “Arian” controversy is now understood as a debate which began before Arius, involved different understandings of the nature of the Trinity, and continued after the “settlement” of 381. This is not to say that there was not a sustained and passionate theological debate during this time period—quite the contrary.

⁷ “Arian” controversy, see Williams, *Arius*, 1–25; Maurice Wiles, *Archetypal Heresy: Arianism Through the Centuries* (New York: Oxford, 1996), and Thomas Ferguson, “The Enthralling Heretical Power: History and Heresy in John Henry Newman,” *Anglican Theological Review* 85 (2003), 641–662.

⁸ Williams, *Arius*, 22.

⁹ In particular see the recent discussion in Vaggione, 376–377; see also Winrich Lohr, “A Sense of Tradition: the Homoiousian Church Party,” in *Arianism after Arius*, 81–100. For a discussion on the debates about the theology of Origen in the pre-Nicene church, see Tim Vivian, *Peter of Alexandria: Bishop and Martyr* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988); Williams, *Arius*, 124–174; and Jon Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius and the Legacy of Origen* (Macon, GA: North American Patristic Society Monograph Series, 1988), 96–124.

⁹ The work of recent historical scholarship has demonstrated this. In particular see Timothy Barnes’ reconstruction of the church just before and immediately following the Council of Nicaea in *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), and *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993); see Wiles, “Attitudes to Arius in the Arian Controversy,” and Rebecca Lyman, “A Topography of Heresy: Mapping the Rhetorical Creation of Arianism,” *Arianism after Arius*, 45–62.

Rejecting labels of “heresy” and “orthodoxy” has in fact provided a greater awareness of the variety of factors which contributed to the construction of orthodoxy. Factors such as Scriptural exegesis, imperial involvement, sheer force of personalities, and issues of gender, to give but a few examples, all played substantial roles in the eventual marginalization of “heresy.”¹⁰ Rejecting the “Arian” label has deepened understanding of the theological controversy of the fourth century and the development of Christian doctrine.

This work seeks to further the work of recent scholarship by examining the role of the genre of church history in the theological struggles of the fourth century. A variety of factors combined to give rise to the eventual predominance of Nicene Christianity: the increased role of bishop in the imperial church and the rise of the ascetic movement being two of the most prominent.¹¹ Rebecca Lyman noted that towards the end of the fourth century “New models of asceticism, episcopacy, and theological authority were in intense and often violent political and literary confrontation,”¹² likening the manner in

¹⁰ On the question of Scriptural exegesis, Charles Kannengiesser’s *Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology: the Arian Crisis* (Colloquy/The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, the GTU and the University of California, Berkeley, CA, 1982) was an important work. On imperial involvement, including the personalities involved, see Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius* and Hal Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: the Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000). For the role of gender in the construction of heresy, see Virginia Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

¹¹ For a description of new paradigms of power in the church, see Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison, WI: the University of Wisconsin Press, 1992), in particular 71–158. A.H.M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 184–602: a Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1964), 873–937, remains a thorough overview. See also Richard Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995) on the role of rhetoric in Late Antique understandings of power. On the question of asceticism, see David Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995); Susanna Elm, *Virgins of God: the Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994); Philip Rousseau, “Christian Asceticism and the Early Monks,” in *Early Christianity: Origins and Evolutions to AD 600*, Ian Hazlett, ed., (Nashville: Abingdon, 1991), 112–122; see also Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 213–427.

¹² Rebecca Lyman, “Origen as Ascetic Theologian: Orthodoxy and Authority in the Fourth-Century Church,” *Origeniana Septima* (Leuven: University Press, 1999), 187.

which these factors came together as a “complex alchemy.”¹³ This dissertation will examine the contribution of church history in creating the alchemist’s philosopher’s stone of Nicene Orthodoxy. Given that the “Arian” controversy is no longer an accurate term, we must turn as critical an eye on the role that the writing of history played in the fourth century as scholars have with regard to other literary genres. The literary construction of “Arianism” by later church historians is an important piece in the development of the “Arian” controversy, as is evidence of a corresponding diversity in historical as well as theological understandings of the fourth century. As the century drew to a close, various authors began to compose continuations of the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius. There was a wide variety of interpretation of the events of the fourth century, but eventually a Nicene version of events passed into the historical consciousness of the church. Historical diversity went the way of theological diversity, and Athanasius’ polemical construct was institutionalized through the *Ecclesiastical History* of Rufinus and the later historians Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, and became the historiographic shorthand for summarizing the fourth century. Despite the work done in reinterpreting the theological climate, corresponding work in the study of church history remains to be done. This historiographic shorthand did not come about naturally. It was part of an elaborate and detailed appropriation of the fourth century by later authors.

It is true that reconstructing the theological developments of the fourth century has necessitated that scholars of Late Antiquity determine the proper chronology of events, and the movements and developing ideas of individuals. This has been an important part of setting the development of doctrine within the historical context of the fourth-century. Yet the church historians themselves have only played a tangential role so far in examining the construction of Nicene orthodoxy and of the “Arian” controversy. They are cited in scholars’ works to support various historical reconstructions, but they themselves have not been scrutinized.¹⁴ In the service of placing the

¹³ Lyman, “Origen as Ascetic Theologian,” 187.

¹⁴ This tendency to use the church historians to reconstruct the careers of figures involved in the theological debates of the fourth century has been common to many works in recent years. For example, in both *Constantine and Eusebius* and *Athanasius and Constantius* Timothy Barnes relies heavily on Eusebius, Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret for his historical reconstructions, yet gives no insight into the moti-

development of doctrine in context, church history has yet to be examined for creating that context. In addition they are also often ignored because of perceived historical inaccuracies and theological biases. Inherent in these assumptions is that church history is not as important a source as theology in constructing Christian identity; it only plays a complementary role, since these histories are considered by nature partisan and inaccurate.

All too often the church historians have been read from two particular perspectives. One is concerned with comparing them to traditions of Graeco-Roman historiography, showing how church history emerged from previously existing historiographic patterns.¹⁵ The second has to do with just the opposite: demonstrating what was unique about church history.¹⁶ One such author was bold to say that “Ecclesiastical history was a new way of looking at the past which sprang, fully formed, from the head of Eusebius of Caesarea early in the fourth century AD.”¹⁷ I propose to supplement this foundational work by examining the church historians in a different fashion. Church histories have an important role to play if we consider these works as texts produced by particular theological communities for specific purposes. Historically, Christian theology developed locally with particular traits and indebted to prominent local teachers and leaders. For example, North African Christianity was known for its rigorism and drew particularly from the writings of leaders such as

vations of these authors. Vaggione, in *Eunomius*, notes that the fourth century was very much a struggle over rival visions of the past; however, he confines his discussion of that struggle to the main theological participants and not to the church historians. In his work Rousseau limits discussion of historical topics to reconstructing the career of another participant in the theological debates, Basil of Caesarea.

¹⁵ An example of such a perspective is Glenn Chesnut’s *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1986). Chesnut examines Eusebius and his successors from the perspective of the role of fortuna/fate/determinism in their histories, showing how they are in continuity and discontinuity with the ancient historiographic tradition. For further discussion on Socrates, in particular see the recent edition of his *Ecclesiastical History* in the *Sources Chrétiennes, Histoire ecclésiastique, Livre I*, Pierre Périchon and Pierre Maraval, trans; introduction and notes by Pierre Maraval (Paris: Cerf, 2004).

¹⁶ See Arnold Momigliano, “Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century A.D.,” *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), 79–100.

¹⁷ Jill Harries, “Patristic Historiography,” in *Early Christianity: Origins and Evolutions to AD 600*, Ian Hazlett, ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1991), 269.

Tertullian and Cyprian.¹⁸ Likewise there is the famous school of Alexandria, whose particular charisms Christian tradition has attributed to prominent teachers such as Clement and Origen, though recent scholarship has called much of this portrait into question.¹⁹ After leaving Alexandria Origen went on to place his mark on the developing school of Caesarea, from which emerged the confessor and teacher Pamphilus and the bishop Eusebius. Antioch in turn was home to the perhaps lesser-known, but still influential, school of Lucian, the prominent scholar, exegete, and martyr.²⁰ All of these various communities gathered libraries containing texts which were important markers of their community identity, and produced biblical commentaries, theological treatises, and apologies, drawing their inspiration and authority from prominent teachers.²¹ The central component of this work will be to see the work of the church historians as crucial in developing a literary expression of group identity for localized expressions of Christianity. Church history is critical as the narrative of community identity. Local churches traced their

¹⁸ For North African Christianity, see Timothy Barnes, *Tertullian: a Literary and Historical Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985); David Rankin, *Tertullian and the Church* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Cecil Robeck, *Prophecy in Carthage: Perpetua, Tertullian, and Cyprian* (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 1992); and Michael Sage, *Cyprian* (Cambridge, MA: Philadelphia Patristic Monograph Series, No. 1), 1975.

¹⁹ For a discussion of the school of Alexandria as it has functioned in historiography, see Alain Le Boulluec, “L’école d’Alexandrie: de quelques aventures d’un concept historiographique,” *Mélanges offerts au Père Claude Mondésert*, Christian Decobert, ed. (Le Caire: Institut français d’archéologie orientale, 1992), 403–417; Annewies van den Hoek, “The ‘Catechetical’ School of Early Christian Alexandria and Its Philonic Heritage,” in *Forms of Devotion: Conversion, Worship, Spirituality, and Asceticism*, Everett Ferguson, ed. (New York: Garland, 1999); and Gustave Bardy, “Aux origines de l’école d’Alexandrie,” *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 27 (1937), 65–90. See also Le Boulluec’s essay, “L’École d’Alexandrie,” in *Histoire du christianisme, Volume 1: Le Nouveau peuple (des origines à 250)*, Luce Pietri, ed. (Paris: Desclée, 2000), 531–578, where he argues for the need to understand the broad range of diversity within Alexandrian Christianity, and to take a more critical and nuanced look at exactly how formal the catechetical “school” really was.

²⁰ The classic work on Lucian remains Gustave Bardy’s *Lucian d’Antioche et son école* (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses fils, 1936). See also relevant discussion of Lucian in Hanson, *Search*, 79–83; and Vaggione, *Eunomius*, 44–47; see also the essays by Hans Christof Brennecke, “Lukian von Antiochien in der Geschichte des arianischen Streites,” in *Logos: Festschrift für Luise Abramowski zum 8. Juli 1993*, Hans C. Brennecke and Ernst Ludwig, eds. (New York: De Gruyter, 1993), and “Lucian von Antiochien,” *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 21 (1991), 474–479.

²¹ For a discussion of the libraries during this time period, including Eusebius’ library in Caesarea, see Harry Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

identity through a detailed and nuanced narrative of their origin from authoritative teachers and legitimate successors. Church history will be read as the embellishment and justification of such particular theological successions.

The question of the role of religious communities in the development of “Arianism” and Nicene Christianity has been addressed in recent works. Rowan Williams argued that the “Arian” controversy was in part a struggle between what he termed an “academic” model of Christianity over and against a developing “Catholic” one. The “academic” model, in his argument, represented the old tradition of schools centered around prominent teachers. This school tradition gave a prominent place to presbyters and their teaching authority. However, according to Williams, this model came into conflict with the developing “Catholic” model, centered around the episcopacy.²² David Brakke also addressed the question of the relationship between religious communities and paradigms of authority. For Brakke, the developing ascetic movement was a critical piece in the struggle between Nicene and non-Nicene Christianity, particularly in relation to paradigms of church authority centered around the episcopate. Brakke argues that Athanasius successfully managed to suborn female ascetic communities in Alexandria to the authority of the episcopate as part of a larger effort on his part to harness the ascetic movement in the service of centralization of authority in the episcopate.²³ Both of these authors have in some way examined the struggle between Nicene and non-Nicene Christianity against the backdrop of developing understandings of authority and new paradigms of authority. My perspective on the role of religious communities and the work of the church historians differs. Most importantly, this work is not an attempt to reconstruct the unfolding of the controversy: rather it focuses on the church historians writing as members of religious communities, Nicene and non-Nicene, attempting to reconstruct the past to conform to their own, current, historical realities. In addition, in this work the contributions of church historians takes its place alongside those of others as fundamental in shaping an eventual predominance of Nicene Christianity. Alongside Athanasius’ works and the writing of the Cappadocians, the church

²² See Williams, *Arius*, 82–91.

²³ Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*, in particular 36–79.

history of Rufinus of Aquileia is also essential to understanding Nicene Christianity. Likewise the work of Philostorgius must be taken into account along with non-Nicene documents such as the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the *Commentary on Job*.

This argument will unfold in four stages. Chapter 2 will examine Eusebius of Caesarea's *Ecclesiastical History*, demonstrating how it functions as both apology and narrative of community origins. I will look in particular detail at his apology for the school of Caesarea, noting the attention shown not only to the teacher Origen, which has been noted by other scholars,²⁴ but also his prominent disciples and their actions. Furthermore I will look at how the lengthy Panegyrical Oration in Book 10 fits into the continuum of this apology. Book 10 has mystified studies of Eusebius; recent works have tended to ignore it almost entirely.²⁵ Ancient writers were equally confused if not embarrassed. In his translation of Eusebius, Rufinus even leaves out Book 10 entirely!²⁶ Rejecting clear delineations between history and theology allows Book 10 to be read as a significant piece in Eusebius' apology for his own Caesarean community. In addition I will look at how Eusebius' *Life of Constantine* functions as part of this model of church history. Often maligned for perceived factual errors, deemed by some so hopelessly flawed that it cannot be the work of Eusebius at all,²⁷ the *Life* demonstrates an extension of the principles set forth in the *Ecclesiastical History*. As such it is in continuity with the author's overall purposes. In looking at these examples I will show how Eusebius' work, set in context, reveals the careful editing, collecting, and presentation of documents in the service of defending a particular school of thought and community of belief. This will be designated as the "Eusebian" paradigm of church history and used as a hermeneutic for examining the work of subsequent historians.

Chapter 3 serves three purposes. First, I will explore how the historical work of Athanasius stands in continuity with this Eusebian model. Writing in the heat of polemic controversy, Athanasius is

²⁴ For example, see Patricia Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity: Quest for the Holy Man* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

²⁵ For example Timothy Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 163.

²⁶ Rufinus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Preface. *Patrologia Latina* 21: 463.

²⁷ See discussion in Averil Cameron and Stuart Hall, *Eusebius: Life of Constantine* (New York: Oxford, 1999), 4–9.

likewise concerned with defending local theological traditions, drawing authority from the martyred bishop Peter and Athanasius' predecessor, Alexander. Second, I will explore how this paradigm of church history cuts across notions of "heresy" and "orthodoxy." I will examine the fragments of an anonymous chronicler who wrote in the mid-fourth century and whose work is perhaps the first attempt to write a continuation of Eusebius. We will see how this Chronicler's history, like Eusebius', is both apology and foundation for a local theological tradition. Whereas Eusebius stood in the tradition of the school of Caesarea, this author emerged from a community which drew its identity from Lucian the Martyr, with significant presence in Nicomedia and Antioch. This author's work, like that of Eusebius, is concerned with chronicling the accomplishments of the founding teacher, defending his teaching, and noting his martyrdom. After establishing the authority of the teacher, his history is also concerned with the succession of disciples down to the present. These aspects mark this anonymous and overlooked chronicler as an important link in the development of church history as a theological statement of a community. Third, reconstructing the chronicler's work from scattered fragments is part of the necessary task of recovering lost narratives and further demonstrating the diversity which marked the fourth century.

Chapter 4 will show how this Eusebian paradigm developed in Nicene Christianity. After a brief discussion of the place of Epiphanius of Salamis in the study of church history, I will examine the *Ecclesiastical History* of Rufinus of Aquileia. Best known for his translation of Origen's works, Rufinus' historical work has often been overlooked. He has been derided as merely a translator and incapable or making noteworthy or original theological contributions.²⁸ I will show how his *Ecclesiastical History* is another piece in the development of

²⁸ See discussion in Francis Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia: His Life and Works* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1945) and Philip Amidon, *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997). The added volume on Latin Christian literature of Johannes Quasten's *Patrology* passes over Rufinus' historical work by noting that "nearly all of Rufinus' works are translations, and it is not necessary to deal again with their content . . ." See Angelo di Berardino, ed., *Patrology*, Volume IV (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1988), 248. This negative characterization has been rebutted by Elizabeth Clark, *The Origenist Controversy: the Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: University Press, 1992), 159–193.

church history. In translating Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* Rufinus made a number of changes. He substantially edited Books 1–9 and left out Book 10 completely. More important than his editorial work, Rufinus composed two additional books which covered the period from the beginning of the “Arian” controversy to the death of Theodosius. As the first fully extant author to recount the history of the fourth century from a Nicene perspective, Rufinus has a critical role to play as a transitional figure in the development of church history. Rufinus both stands in continuity and discontinuity with the historical paradigm evidenced by Eusebius, Athanasius, and the anonymous chronicler. Like them, his church history functions as an apology for his community of belief. In his case this was Nicene orthodoxy as it emerged from the pen of Athanasius, combined with his defense of the theology of Origen occasioned by Jerome's polemical writings.²⁹ As part of his defense of Nicene Orthodoxy, Rufinus also reinterpreted the role of imperial authority in the theological disputes of the fourth century. In addition, he presents an idealized and elaborate portrayal of Athanasius, Basil of Caesarea, and Gregory of Nazianzus. Reflecting his own circumstances, Rufinus places particular emphasis on the place of the monastic movement in the development of Nicene Christianity. In doing so Rufinus demonstrates a paradigm shift in the understanding of authority in the church. There are extraordinary political, social, and cultural differences between writing in the year 400 than when Eusebius was writing during the early years of Constantine, or during the turbulent middle decades, as in Athanasius or the anonymous chronicler. While constructing a narrative of origin for his theological tradition, Rufinus reflects the changing historical context. He demonstrates a shift from the local school of thought loyal to the authoritative teacher to positing authority in the ascetic bishop as locus of holy power and doctrinal orthodoxy. The Eusebian paradigm of church history will be poured into the wineskins of Nicene orthodoxy in a post-Constantinian ecclesial worldview.

Chapter 5, however, will show that Nicene historiography was in no way “settled” by the work of Rufinus, just as “Arianism” was not settled by the Council of Constantinople in 381. With the work of Philostorgius of Borissus we have evidence of non-Nicene historio-

²⁹ See Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, 11–42 and 121–151.

graphy persisting well into the fifth century. Despite his significance as a non-Nicene source for the fourth century, Philostorgius's historical work has been almost routinely ignored. Surveys of church history fail to include his work when addressing the historians of the fourth century.³⁰ Philostorgius' church history, which exists only in an epitome composed by Photius and in scattered fragments, is important for two reasons.

First, one should note that methodologically the gap between “heresy” and “orthodoxy” is not that great; as a writer Philostorgius is doing very much the same as Rufinus. This fact is often obscured by the reductionist conclusion that Philostorgius is somehow providing a mirror opposite of Nicene Orthodoxy. Philostorgius' work is much more complex than this. He is attempting to claim the authoritative fourth century for his own theological tradition. In doing so he deals with the Council of Nicaea, the role of the emperor, and Athanasius of Alexandria, just as Rufinus did, from a fundamentally non-Nicene perspective, emerging from a detailed and substantial theological tradition. One cannot blithely assert that he is providing an alternative history without examining the motivations behind writing such a work and looking at the community of belief from which it emerged; to do otherwise is to continue to privilege one historical narrative as normative.

Second, in Philostorgius we will see that he is adapting the Eusebian paradigm to a worldview which also must take into account imperial and conciliar authority. Philostorgius is writing several decades after Rufinus; the witches' brew of Nicene orthodoxy had been simmering for forty more years. The theological language of the Council of Constantinople was coming to predominate discussions of the nature of the Godhead; imperial authority and patronage of the

³⁰ As, for example, in Chesnut's *The First Christian Histories*, where Philostorgius is not mentioned. Furthermore, in his article “Eusebius, Augustine, Orosius, and the Later Patristic and Medieval Historians,” in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Harold Attridge and Gohei Hata, eds. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 687–713, Chesnut again dismisses Philostorgius. In addition, despite a spate of articles and several monographs published on Eusebius, Rufinus, and Socrates, there has been a single article on Philostorgius published in the last decade, Alanna M. Nobbs’ “Philostorgius’ Ecclesiastical History: An ‘Alternative Ideology’”, *Tyndale Bulletin* 42 (1991), 271–281. Nobbs’ article treats Philostorgius rather superficially, outlining his biography and demonstrating his alternative take on the events of the fourth century. The only monograph on Philostorgius remains Pierre Batiffol’s thesis, *Quaestiones Philostorgianae* (Paris: Lahure, 1891).

Nicene church party continued; and the monastic movement had become more widespread and influential. Like Rufinus, Philostorgius' heroes from the fourth century are also holy men and wonderworkers: yet their locus of power and authority does not come from their asceticism or their role as bishops. Rather, reflecting the legacy of Philostorgius' theological traditions, it comes from their right belief, which in turn derives from their inherent, divinely-given power of rhetoric and disputation. In Philostorgius, the Eusebian paradigm is poured into Eunomian wineskins in a world shaped by the religious policy of the house of Theodosius.

In the conclusion the implications of interpreting the fourth century and the church historians in this manner will be explored. By rejecting a dichotomy between “history” and “theology” as well as “heresy” and “orthodoxy,” a new perspective on the search for the Christian doctrine of God will arise. By seeing church history as theological statements produced by particular faith communities, I hope to shed new light on the eventual predominance of Nicene theology. For centuries it was assumed that the reason Nicene Christianity predominated was that it was simply better: more faithful to the Scriptures and to Christian tradition. Yet if Nicene orthodoxy is not inherently superior to non-Nicene theology, then how does one explain its eventual hegemony? Recent scholars have attempted to identify political, social, cultural, linguistic, and biblical factors. Examining church history as theological narratives justifying worshipping communities, in particular drawing contrasts between how Rufinus and Philostorgius adapted themselves to the shifting cultural context, will provide another lens to examine the predominance of Nicene Orthodoxy. Nicene church historians demonstrated a more thorough appropriation of the past and inculcation of new models of episcopacy and asceticism than the non-Nicenes. This has been shown by Brakke, Williams, and others. Their work has shown how the predominance of Nicene Christianity was in part a result of competing models of authority and community. However the predominance of Nicene Christianity is as much about the attempts to claim the authoritative legacy of the fourth century by later historians. To paraphrase Dylan, the times changed, the waters rose, and the non-Nicenes were drenched to the bone.

CHAPTER TWO

THE EUSEBIAN PRELUDE: BE TRUE TO YOUR SCHOOL

I. INTRODUCTION

In attempting to reconstruct the historical narrative of the “Arian” controversy, one has to look beyond the “synoptic” church historians of the second half of the fourth century.¹ While Rufinus, Socrates, and Sozomen are the crucial authors who determine the Nicene church’s historical memory of the fourth century, they are building on the foundations of prior generations’ historical work. This chapter will examine the most important model and figure for anyone attempting to write church history, Eusebius Pamphilus: scholar, follower of Origen, inheritor of the library and school of Caesarea, and later bishop of that city.² After describing how later historians

¹ So dubbed by Pierre Batiffol in his article, “Un historiographe anonyme arien du IV^e siècle,” *Römische Quartalschrift* 9 (1895), 57: “historiens synoptiques du V^e siècle, Philostorge, Socrate, Sozomène, Théodoret . . .”

² J.B. Lightfoot’s “Eusebius of Caesarea,” in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (London: 1880), 308–348, remains an early and important work in Eusebian studies. This was followed by source-critical work of Laqueur, primarily in *Eusebius als Historiker seiner Zeit* (Berlin, 1929). This in turn was followed by the work of Gustave Bardy on the critical edition of the *Ecclesiastical History* in the *Sources Chrétiennes*, not completed until 1960; see Bardy, *Histoire ecclésiastique: texte grec, traduction et annotation*, SC vols. 31, 41, 55, 73 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952–60). For more recent work on Eusebius see Robert Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980). Grant’s work has been followed by renewed interest in the work of Eusebius. Colm Luibheid’s 1981 thesis *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Arian Crisis* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1981) examined Eusebius’ role in doctrinal discussions surrounding the Council of Nicaea. Glenn Chesnut devoted the bulk of his *First Christian Histories* to Eusebius. An important collection of essays appeared in 1992, dealing with a variety of aspects of the *Ecclesiastical History*. *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, Harold Attridge and Gohei Hata, eds. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), contained essays by such scholars as Timothy Barnes, Chesnut, and Charles Kannengiesser. The essays deal with Eusebius as exegete, historian, Origenist, as well as his understanding of Judaism and paganism, his historiographic legacy, and other topics. A recent monograph on Eusebius picks up on one of these themes, focusing on the role of Judaism in Eusebius; see Jorg Ulrich, *Euseb von Caesarea und die Juden: Studien zur Rolle der Juden in der Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999). See also Rebecca Lyman, *Christology and Cosmology: Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius* (New York: Oxford, 1993), 82–123. See also

are indebted to Eusebius, this chapter will examine Eusebius' historical work. While recent scholarship has been instrumental in providing greater understanding as to the methods, motives, context, and composition of the *Ecclesiastical History*, this chapter will focus on larger themes which dominate Eusebius' work as a historian and include his *Life of Constantine* in this examination.³ For Eusebius history, particularly recent history, functioned as a narrative of origins for his theological community.⁴ His historical work was less an attempt to relate facts and events and more of a process of collecting and editing a variety of sources to construct an apology not only for Christianity, but in addition for the theological tradition of the school of Caesarea.⁵ First, I will examine Books 6–7 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, looking at Eusebius' apology not only for Origen but for the school of Caesarea. I will then look at how Eusebius' panegyrical oration in Book 10 of the *Ecclesiastical History* functions as a crucial historical interpretation of the Great Persecution informed by exeget-

Michael Hollerich's recent study of Eusebius' exegetical work, *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah: Christian Exegesis in the Age of Constantine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), particularly 185–187 and 191–196.

³ This particular focus on Eusebius' work as a historian should be read in light of a broader understanding of his significance in the Nicene and post-Nicene church. Hollerich has noted that the emphasis on Eusebius' historical work has “neglected the place of Eusebius’ theology, exegesis, and apologetics (Hollerich, 4).” Along with a greater appreciation of other aspects of Eusebius’ work, I hope to shed new light on his historical endeavors.

⁴ For an understanding of the role that texts can play in the self-construction of community identity, I am indebted to the work of New Testament scholars. Burton Mack, in his 1988 work *Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) discussed how one of the functions of the Gospel of Mark was to serve as a narrative of community identity and formation. See also the essay by Ron Cameron, “Alternative Beginnings—Different Ends: Eusebius, Thomas, and the Construction of Christian Origins,” in *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*, Lukas Borman, Kelly del Tredici, and Angela Standhartinger, eds. (New York: Brill, 1994), 501–525. Drawing upon previous historiography in showing Eusebius’ indebtedness to the Gospel of Luke in his writing of history, Cameron shows that the *Gospel of Thomas* provides an alternative understanding of the person of Jesus and the early Christian community. Cameron calls for a reassessment of Christian origins apart from what he identifies as the Eusebian/Lukan model.

⁵ For a discussion of the apologetic elements of Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History* in regard to Christianity’s place in Late Antiquity, see the essay by Arthur Doge, “The Apologetic Dimensions of the *Ecclesiastical History*,” in *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, 492–509, and Lyman, *Christology and Cosmology*, 83–90. For Eusebius’ other apologetic work, see Michael Frede, “Eusebius’ Apologetic Writings,” *Apologetics in the Roman Empire*, Mark Edward, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price, eds. (Oxford: University Press, 1999), 223–250.

ical methods derived from the school of Caesarea and the writings of Origen. Third, I will turn to the *Life of Constantine* to see how Eusebius' presentation of the Council of Nicaea and the “Arian” controversy is an extension of principles set forward in the *Ecclesiastical History*. In each of these examples Eusebius combined his stated historical goals with a loyalty to his theological tradition and succession of Caesarean teachers.

Eusebius' significance on the later synoptic historians as both a model and a source cannot be underestimated. Most of the extant later historians explicitly profess to be following Eusebius, beginning with Rufinus' translation and additions to the *Ecclesiastical History*.⁶ Of the synoptic historians, Socrates is particularly indebted to Eusebius. “Eusebius Pamphilus” are the opening words of his work, and he quotes from Eusebius directly more than the other historians.⁷ Theodoret likewise pays homage to Eusebius in the opening of his work, yet without the explicit critique of Rufinus and Socrates, merely noting that his version will continue from the point where Eusebius left off.⁸ His concern is to supplement Eusebius, not to correct any

⁶ Rufinus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Preface. Text in Migne, PL 21:461–540; English translation in Amidon, *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia*. Rufinus, as opposed to later synoptic historians, felt the need to justify a continuation of Eusebius. Rufinus cites “apostolic tradition,” seeing a sequel to Eusebius as the continuation of Jesus’ commandment to provide bread for the faithful. In addition Rufinus also notes deficiencies in Eusebius’ work that required revision, remarking that Book 10 of the *Ecclesiastical History* had “very little history in it, all the rest being taken up with bishop’s panegyrics which add nothing to our knowledge of the facts (Amidon, 4).”

⁷ Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History*, 1.1: “Ἐνσέβιος ὁ Παμφίλου ἐν ὅλοις δέκα βιβλίοις τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ιστορίαν ἐκθέμενος κατέπαυσεν.” Quotations from Gunther Christian Hansen, *Sokrates Kirchengeschichte GCS*, Neue Folge, Vol. 1 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995). Like Rufinus, Socrates faults Eusebius for his lack of attention to historical facts, in this case in regard to the “Arian” controversy. Socrates also goes beyond Rufinus by including the *Life of Constantine* in his critique. For a recent discussion of Eusebius as a model for Socrates, see Theresa Urbainczyk, *Socrates of Constantinople: Historian of Church and State* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 41–42.

⁸ Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History* 1.1.2–4: “For this reason I too shall attempt to record in writing events in ecclesiastical history hitherto omitted . . . Trusting, however, in the bounty of the Giver of all good, I enter upon a task beyond my own strength. Eusebius of Palestine has written a history of the Church from the time of the holy Apostles to the reign of Constantine, the prince beloved of God. I shall begin my history from the period at which his terminates,” English translation by Blomfield Jackson, *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*, Series 2, Vol. 3, 34. Citations from Theodoret follow the book and chapter numbering from the Greek text edited in Leon Parmentier, *Theodoret Kirchengeschichte*, GCS, Neue Folge, Band 5 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1998).

supposed bias. Of the Nicene writers, Sozomen is the most reluctant to cite Eusebius directly. Eusebius makes a late appearance in Sozomen's work; he is not mentioned until Book 6, in a discussion of the events surrounding the Council of Tyre in 335.⁹ Sozomen also does not mention Eusebius or the *Ecclesiastical History* as a source or a model for his work. Thus, unlike the other authors, Eusebius does not figure in Sozomen's introduction. Sozomen's introduction is focused instead almost exclusively on praise of Theodosius.¹⁰ Even though Sozomen is not as forthcoming in identifying Eusebius as a source, nonetheless his history would not be possible without the model of Eusebius. Sozomen's history is built upon Socrates',¹¹ who was in turn, as shown above, as very consciously modeling his work after Eusebius.

Apart from these Nicene writers, Eusebius also appears in the opening of the church history of the non-Nicene historian Philostorgius. Like Rufinus and Socrates, Philostorgius wrote an *Ecclesiastical History* which picks up where Eusebius left off. It survived in a summary chapter in Photius' *Bibliotheca* and in a lengthier epitome.¹² While also providing a continuation of Eusebius, Philostorgius does so from an entirely different perspective than his Nicene counterparts. Representative of the theological traditions of the Aetius and Eunomius, Philostorgius provides a non-Nicene perspective of the events of the fourth century. Despite the differences, like his Nicene counterparts, Philostorgius also criticized Eusebius. In his epitome, Photius tells us that while Philostorgius praised Eusebius in regard to his historical work he nonetheless criticized Eusebius on theological grounds. For Philostorgius, Eusebius' theology was faulty for asserting that God was unknowable.¹³ This assertion was something which Philostorgius,

⁹ Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History* 6.12.2. Quotations from Joseph Bidez, *Sozomenus Kirchengeschichte*, GCS, Neue Folge, Vol. 4 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995).

¹⁰ When looking at antecedents for writing history, Sozomen cites not Eusebius or Socrates but examples of classical patrons and historians, citing the relationships between Dionysius of Sicily and Plato, and Philip of Macedonia and Theopompus, among others. See Sozomen, Preface 5.

¹¹ This is not to presume that there is no difference between the two; the three synoptic church historians were often lumped together and their differences minimized. See Urbainczyk, 1–2.

¹² Quotations from Philostorgius will follow the book and chapter number provided by Joseph Bidez in his critical edition, *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972).

¹³ For his comment regarding Eusebius, see Philostorgius, 1.2: “Concerning this

standing in the Aetian/Eunomian tradition whereby God's essence was revealed and understood as being ingenerate, found unacceptable.¹⁴ In addition to Philostorgius, there is further evidence of the efforts of non-Nicene faith communities to offer their own interpretations of the “Arian” controversy. In fact, there is strong evidence to believe that the first author to attempt a continuation of Eusebius was an anonymous “Arian” historian of the 350s.¹⁵ Since this work exists only in various fragments which have passed into later chroniclers, we do not have a prefatory statement in which this author might also have explicitly cited Eusebius as his inspiration or his own reasons for writing a continuation of the *Ecclesiastical History*. But while the introduction or any methodological statements of the author have been lost, from the fragments (which will be examined in the next chapter) we know that at times he relied heavily on Eusebius as a source, using the *Ecclesiastical History* to supplement his own sources. What is important for framing our discussion of Eusebius is that the works of Philostorgius and the anonymous “Arian” reveal a common need and desire for both Nicene and non-Nicene faith communities to write continuations of Eusebius’ work in order to interpret the recent past, although few accept his legacy without correction or criticism.

It is significant that both Nicene and non-Nicene historians invoke Eusebius in the opening of their works in regards to interpretation of the recent past. All of the authors note that their main goal is to continue his work, and their critique is confined to his interpretation of recent history. The later historians do not fault Eusebius for his discussion and interpretation of events prior to the reign of Constantine. It is only in Eusebius’ recounting of events of his own

historical work, Philostorgius praises Eusebius Pamphilus . . . and the accusation he brings against him as that he considered the Divine was unknowable and incomprehensible (διότι ἄγνωστον τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἀκατάληπτον ἤγοτο (Bidez, 6).” Unless otherwise noted, translations from Philostorgius are my own.

¹⁴ The most complete discussion of Aetius’ and Eunomius’ theology remains Kopeczek’s *A History of Neo-Arianism*. For a discussion of Aetius’ theology, in particular his *Syntagmation*, see Kopeczek, 226–297; for a discussion of Eunomius’ theology, see 301–346. See also Hanson, *Search*, 603–610 and 622–636.

¹⁵ This theory was first propounded in H.M. Gwatkin’s *Studies of Arianism* (Cambridge, 1882), 216–218, and developed more fully by Pierre Batiffol, “Un historiographe anonyme arien du IV^e siècle,” 57–97. In his edition of Philostorgius’ *Ecclesiastical History* Bidez collects the fragments of this historian; see also Bidez’ introduction, CLI–CLXIII.

time, primarily the “Arian” controversy, that authors, both Nicene and non-Nicene, felt the need to correct his work. There is an important assumption inherent in such reasoning by these ancient authors which bears exploration, because they are insights into the motives of his continuators in writing their histories.

The assumption is that Eusebius needs to be corrected in the discussion of the events of his own time because he does not properly relate those events. Rufinus notes that Book 10 of Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History* is devoted to panegyric, and not of much use in determining the facts of the time period. Socrates goes even further, including the *Life of Constantine* as well in his critique of Eusebius’ discussion of the “Arian” controversy.¹⁶ Both of these authors, who are the foundation of the Nicene historical interpretation of the fourth century, thus felt the need to correct and amend Eusebius in order to provide a proper version of events of the fourth century. The proper version is a Nicene one, relying heavily on the historical evidence supplied by Athanasius. Theodoret, the other Nicene historian who mentions Eusebius explicitly, does not have the same factual critique of Socrates and Rufinus. Though also writing from a Nicene perspective, he reveals a different motivation from Rufinus and Socrates. Theodoret promises to include events which others, including Eusebius, have left out.¹⁷ This allows Theodoret to focus on matters concerning Antiochene and Syriac Christianity which have particular relevance in light of the theological climate in which he wrote. In particular Theodoret is defending the orthodoxy of the see of Antioch and of his teachers in the face of Cyril’s deposition of Nestorius and proclamation of Alexandrian Christology as orthodox.¹⁸ Philostorgius,

¹⁶ Rufinus notes that “since the tenth book of this work in Greek has very little history in it, all the rest being taken up with bishop’s panegyrics which add nothing to our knowledge of the facts, we have omitted what seemed superfluous and joined what history was in it to the ninth book, which we have made the conclusion to Eusebius’ account (PL 21:463; Amidon, 4).” Socrates tells us that in his *Life of Constantine* “this same author has but slightly treated of matters regarding Arius, being more intent on the rhetorical finish of his composition and the praises of the emperor, than on an accurate statement of facts (Socrates 1.1, translation by A.C. Zenos, *NPNF*, Series 2, Vol. 2, 1).”

¹⁷ Theodoret, 1.1–2: “κάγῳ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ιστορίας τὰ λειπόμενα συγγράψαι πειράσομαι . . .”

¹⁸ Theodoret includes material at various times to demonstrate the zeal and orthodoxy of his predecessors in the Antiochene theological tradition. In 2.19, for example, he introduces Flavian and Diodore, later bishops of Antioch and Tarsus, respectively, and describes their work in establishing the antiphonal singing of the

in including a theological critique of Eusebius while nonetheless praising his historical work, reveals the Eunomian theological worldview that will shape his history. Despite their statements, these authors' critiques of Eusebius' telling of the "Arian" controversy are not critiques concerned solely with establishing a proper chronology of events. Rather they show how each author shapes the historical documents available to him in an attempt to craft a history of the fourth century to justify the theological perspectives of his own faith community, in order to include what is particularly important to him. Thus, the primary assumption that Eusebius needs correcting in regards to his interpretation of recent history must be looked at from the motivations of his continuators.

As we have seen, the rhetorical point of departure for Eusebius' successors, both Nicene and non-Nicene, is the need to correct Eusebius's interpretation of recent history, primarily the issues surrounding the "Arian" controversy. This chapter will examine how particular apologetic elements shaped Eusebius' historical narrative of events either current to him or of particular concern to him. Eusebius provides the blueprint for his *Ecclesiastical History* in the Prologue to the work. He outlines several themes of particular importance, to which he will devote particular attention over the course of the *History*. These include marking the apostolic succession of bishops from the apostles; noting prominent Christian leaders and their works; identifying the variety of "heresies" which flourished; recounting the fate of the Jews; and describing the various persecutions and lauding those who suffered martyrdom.¹⁹ In addition to these stated elements, Eusebius also includes an apology for his own ecclesiastical community and school of Caesarea.

18 Psalms. In 4.10 he includes a disputation between Flavian and a group of Messalian heretics. In 5.10 he describes a dream of Theodosius in which Meletius of Antioch invests him with the imperial robe and crown. He also includes the work of Alexander Theodotus of Antioch in combating Apollinarianism (5.37) as well as noting Theodore of Mopsuestia's contacts with Diodore and his success in combating Eunomius (5.39).

¹⁹ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 1.1–2: "I have purposed to record in writing the successions of the sacred apostles, covering the period stretching from the Saviour to ourselves . . . the number of those who in each generation were ambassadors of the Word of God by speech or pen; the names, number, and age of those who, driven by the desire of innovation to an extremity of error, have heralded themselves as the introducers of Knowledge, falsely so-called, ravaging the flock of Christ unsparingly, like grim wolves. To this I will add the fate of the Jews from the moment of their plot against the Saviour; moreover, the number and nature and

II. DEFENDING THE SCHOOL OF CAESAREA: BOOKS 6 AND 7 OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY

The theological climate just prior to and during the persecution initiated under Dionysius in 303 and finally ended in 312 is another factor that must be incorporated into a renewed understanding of the latter books of the *Ecclesiastical History*. Just as the writing of the later synoptic historians was informed by a climate of theological debate and dissension, so was Eusebius' work. Timothy Barnes has shown that we should not believe that theological discussion ground to a halt during the persecution.²⁰ Arguments concerning church order, belief, and canon all played a central role throughout the history of the church as described in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*. These concerns are spelled out specifically in the prologue to the work. The fact that in the *Ecclesiastical History* Eusebius does not explicitly refer to any such elements during the period of the Great Persecution should not be taken as a sign that theological debate and discussion did not occur, nor that he abandoned his attempt to fulfill the promises made in the prologue to examine these themes. If the “Arian” controversy is to be re-imagined as a larger debate within Christian circles concerning the nature of God which began before Arius and continued after the Council of Constantinople, and took a particular shape and form during the period 318–381, then the theological climate of the church from 270–320 is a crucial piece of this alternative rendering.²¹ Eusebius is our primary source for a period once described by Gustave Bardy as “among the most obscure in the history of the ancient church.”²² The manner in which Eusebius

times of the wars waged by the heathen against the divine word and the character of those who, for its sake, passed from time to time through the contest of blood and torture.” Translation by Kirsopp Lake, *Eusebius: the Ecclesiastical History*, Loeb Classical Library, Volume I (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959), 7–8. For a discussion of the role of the Preface in the composition of the work, see Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 33–44.

²⁰ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 198–199. See also Williams, *Arius*, 117–157, and Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism*, 96–124.

²¹ For an outline of the unfolding of the “Arian” controversy according to this revised paradigm, see Vaggione, *Eunomius*, 376–378.

²² Gustave Bardy, *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d’Antioche et son école*, 5: “L’historien est extrêmement sobre de renseignements sur la période qui s’étend entre 260 environ et le début du IV^e siècle. Ces quarante années sont pour nous parmi les plus obscures dans l’histoire de l’ancienne Église.”

organized and presented the events and issues of the period from 270–320 is thus crucial for both a deeper understanding of how he shaped the history of his own time, as well as for reconstructing an alternative understanding of the development of Nicene “Orthodoxy” and its self-presentation.

Barnes has argued in *Constantine and Eusebius* that a debate regarding the orthodoxy of Origen raged during the period of the Great Persecution, and this debate is reflected in Eusebius’s *Ecclesiastical History*.²³ A sometimes controversial figure in his own lifetime, after Origen’s death concerns arose in some circles concerning several of his statements regarding the nature of the soul, the resurrection, and the relationship between the Father and the Son, to give but a few examples.²⁴ Among those firmly in the anti-Origen camp was Methodius of Olympus in Lycia, who attacked Origen in his treatises *On Free Will* and *On the Resurrection*.²⁵ It is with regards to the figure of Methodius, for example, that we can see how this furor surrounding some elements of Origen’s teachings influenced Eusebius’ writing of history. Due to his animosity towards Origen, Methodius is not mentioned once by Eusebius in the *Ecclesiastical History*, one of the more important figures to receive such short shrift. Fortunately,

²³ Tim Vivian has rightly critiqued the work of Barnes and much of traditional scholarship on the anti-Origenism of Peter in his work *St. Peter of Alexandria: Bishop and Martyr* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988). Vivian argues against a strict understanding of competing Origenist and anti-Origenist successions in Alexandria, and questions some of the works attributed to Peter by Barnes. Nonetheless while breaking down conceptions of rigid pro- and anti-Origenist parties, and drawing clear distinctions between the theological debate of the end of the third century and later condemnations of Origen, Vivian does acknowledge varied opinions concerning Origen. He notes that Peter and Dionysius both critiqued Origen in certain regards (Vivian, 112–113), and that Pierius and Theognostus were “undoubtedly” Origenist in their teaching (115–116). While differing from the strict categories and schools of thought as expressed by Barnes, nonetheless the two are in agreement that there was considerable theological discussion surrounding some of Origen’s ideas during this time period.

²⁴ For a discussion of the charges against Origen as outlined by Eusebius and Pamphilus in their *Apology*, see Pierre Nautin, *Origène: Sa vie et son oeuvre* (Beauchesne: Paris, 1977), 114–144. For a discussion of later development charges against Origen, see Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, 85–158.

²⁵ See Lloyd Patterson, *Methodius of Olympus: Divine Sovereignty, Human Freedom, and Life in Christ* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1997), 4–7, 170–186. Patterson notes that Eusebius’ “disinclination to celebrate a critic of Origen contributed, in some part, to leaving Methodius in obscurity (Patterson, 1).” Vivian also agrees that Methodius attacked Origen (Vivian, 120), though rightly notes that Peter cannot be included in such an attack as other scholars have argued.

unlike some authors for whom Eusebius represents the only manner in which their works were preserved, a lengthy extract from Methodius' *On the Resurrection* is preserved by a later critic of Origen, Epiphanius of Salamis in his *Panarion*.²⁶

Apart from Methodius' critique, we also know of works originating from Caesarea and Alexandria which vigorously defended Origen. As regards Alexandria, from Photius' *Bibliotheca* we know that successive teachers at the catechetical school, Theognostus and Pierius, continued to hold Origen in high esteem. Theognostus composed a work entitled *Hypotyposes* which “was clearly intended to be a comprehensive exposition like Origen’s *On First Principles*.²⁷ In Photius’ opinion Theognostus was very much a proponent of Origen’s theology, as he described him as “like Origen . . . seized by impiety” in speaking of the Son as a creature.²⁸ Pierius, a presbyter of Alexandria and also a follower of Origen, composed a work “clear, brilliant, and flowing,”²⁹ and was so prolific and learned that Jerome noted “he was called Origen the younger.”³⁰ His work was composed in twelve books, and deemed by Photius largely orthodox “except that he speaks of two essences,” of the Father and the Son, and follows the “nonsense (*ὕθλος*)” of Origen in regards to the pre-existence of souls.³¹ In Barnes’ reconstruction of the debate, when Peter became bishop of Alexandria he initiated a reaction against the teaching of Origen in his Easter letters and in two distinct works, *On the Soul* and *On the Resurrection*.³² At this point in the controversy, the Great Persecution intervened. However the unsettled state of ecclesiastical affairs did not cut short the debate. In fact, the events of the persecution framed the theological discussions, as the main participants were either in prison or labored in the Egyptian mines, a fact that enhanced their authority as confessors.

²⁶ Epiphanius, *Panarion* 64.19–62.14.

²⁷ Barnes, 198.

²⁸ Photius, *Bibliotheca* 106: “καὶ ἄλλα ὅττα ὥσπερ Ὁριγένης, ἐπιφορεῖ τῷ νίῳ, εἴτε ὄμοιώς ἔκεινῳ δυσσεβείᾳ ἐαλωκώς.” Greek text edited by René Henry, *Photius: Bibliothèque* (Paris: Société d'édition les belles lettres, 1960), 73.

²⁹ Photius, *Bibliotheca* 119; Henry, 93.

³⁰ Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, 76.

³¹ *Bibliotheca* 119; Henry, 93.

³² Specifically, Peter took issue with Origen’s allegorical interpretations of Scripture, his concept of the pre-existence of souls, and the state of the earthly body following the resurrection. See discussion in Barnes, 198–199.

In response to the criticism of Peter, Pamphilus and Eusebius, representing the school of Caesarea, took up a defense of their teacher. Pamphilus did not let imprisonment inhibit his defense of Origen; together with Eusebius, who had access to the library in Caesarea, the two composed a *Defense of Origen* in six books.³³ In five books Pamphilus and Eusebius responded to the criticism leveled against Origen in Alexandria, addressed to the confessors sentenced to the Egyptian mines, who had expressed doubts about Origen's orthodoxy. In a sixth book, added after the death of Pamphilus, Eusebius specifically responded to Methodius' charges against Origen. As Barnes rightly notes, the writings of Peter and response from Pamphilus and Eusebius in the *Defense Against Origen* "shows that theological bickering did not cease during the 'Great Persecution.'"³⁴

Thus Eusebius' narrative perspective operates against the backdrop of both persecution and intense theological debate concerning the orthodoxy of Origen. Eusebius is therefore engaged in a similar apologetic writing of history as his successors. Looking at his work from the backdrop of controversy over Origen, the parallels between Eusebius, the synoptic historians, and non-Nicenes such as Philostorgius become clearer. Like theirs, his historical work was written during a time of intense theological debate, and his loyalty and position in this debate are clear. Eusebius' history contains strong apologetic elements to defend the theological tradition in which he stands, and in doing so provides a model in this regard for all later historians, both Nicene and non-Nicene. This perspective on church history is illuminated by the recent argument of Richard Vaggione. Vaggione notes that much of the debate in the later half of the fourth century was focused on telling different histories of the recent past: "Thus . . . the 'Arian controversy' had become in some respects a battle over rival visions of the past . . ."³⁵ Church history is a key component in this reconstruction of the recent past which only serves

³³ Summarized by Photius, *Bibliotheca* 118. Photius' epitome is largely concerned with the historical facts surrounding the life of Origen as preserved in the *Apology*. Rufinus has also preserved the preface and Book 1 of the work in a Latin translation (PG 17: 541–616). See also the recent critical edition of the *Apology* by René Amacker and Eric Junod, *Apologie pour Origène*, Sources chrétiennes, Vol. 464–465 Paris: Cerf, 2002), especially the background information in 9–24; for a discussion of the motives of Eusebius and Pamphilus in writing, see 75–104.

³⁴ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 200.

³⁵ Vaggione, *Eunomius*, 43.

a tangential role in the primary theological orientation of recent scholarship.

Though emerging from the backdrop of the Diocletian persecution, Eusebius weaves a defense of the school of Origen into the earlier books of the *Ecclesiastical History*. In fact, looking at the *Ecclesiastical History* from this perspective helps to bridge the scholarly gap which has separated Books 1–7 and 8–10.³⁶ By focusing too much on form-critical questions, rather than looking at themes which are developed throughout the work, the plan of the defense of the school of Origen has been limited in recent scholarship. Barnes has argued for vigorous theological discussion during the composition of the *Ecclesiastical History*, yet has failed to look at how that discussion informed Eusebius' writing of history. Scholars have rightly noted the defense of Origen in the biography contained in Book 6 of the *Ecclesiastical History*,³⁷ yet this apologetic strain has not been broadened to encompass the school of Origen, nor has its place within Eusebius' understanding of the overall history of the church been rightly examined.

Book 6 is not only a defense of Origen. It is also the point of departure for Eusebius to weave into his narrative an apology for the theological tradition of which he is the inheritor, and, after the martyrdom of Pamphilus, the leading exponent. This understanding of the composition of Books 6–7 helps to explain Eusebius' organization and presentation of his material. For example, in 6.1 Eusebius begins a lengthy section on Origen's rise to prominence and the Alexandrian catechetical school. In 6.8.7 Eusebius curiously breaks off from this narrative and returns to a chronology of secular events. He informs the reader of the succession of the Emperor Severus by

³⁶ For a summary of the form-critical work establishing various editions of the *Ecclesiastical History*, see Glenn Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories*, 113–119.

³⁷ See Patricia Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity*. Cox summarizes Eusebius' purposes in writing for Christian and pagan audiences (69–71). She also discusses the incident of Origen's castration from Eusebius' apologetic concerns as well part of an overall portrait of Origen as an ascetic holy man (90–91). See also Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 77–82. Grant does not detail any motivation for this apology of Origen other than to note that the emphasis on the life of Origen was probably a result of the research materials which Eusebius had on hand: “To a significant extent Eusebius’ choice of materials about men and events depended on what he had heard in Palestine or found in the libraries, chiefly at Caesarea. Since the Caesarean library was Alexandrian . . . the men and events tended to be Alexandrian . . . it also lays undue emphasis on the life of Origen (Grant, 82).”

Antoninus, moving to a discussion of Bishop Narcissus of Jerusalem. This is his first break from the material regarding Origen which occupies the bulk of Book 6. Why move to a discussion of Narcissus of Jerusalem, apart from a mention of the successors at the other various important sees? The reason for this first break from the biographical material on Origen reveals additional apologetic concerns for the school of Origen. With regard to Narcissus, Eusebius notes his constancy during the persecution under Severus, demonstrates his sanctity by relating the story of the miraculous lighting of the paschal lamps when the oil had failed, and relates how he retired to the ascetic life in response to the intrigues in the see of Jerusalem.³⁸ After two bishops followed him in quick succession, Narcissus returned to Jerusalem, by this time an aged man, “no longer able to perform the ministry.”³⁹ Alexander, bishop of another community,⁴⁰ is called “by the dispensation of God,” through a dream, to visit Jerusalem as a pilgrim. By a second revelation the people of Jerusalem ask Alexander to stay and serve as coadjutor with Narcissus. Such an unusual situation is in turn ratified by the surrounding bishops, who “compelled him to remain.” Eusebius, showing the value of the library of Caesarea, then provides direct evidence of this arrangement, citing a letter from Alexander written to the city of Antinoe. Eusebius quotes Alexander’s closing statement in the letter, where he passes on the greeting of Narcissus, “who before me was holding the position of bishop . . . and now is associated with me in the prayers . . . and exhorts you, as I do likewise, to be of one mind.”⁴¹ Following this interlude describing the succession of the see of Jerusalem, Eusebius turns to matters concerning the see of Antioch in 6.12 before returning to a discussion of Origen and the Alexandrian church in 6.13. In doing so he does not include the bishops of Rome or other sees as he often does in short summary chapters. Concern for the succession of the apostolic sees has been a particular concern

³⁸ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 6.9.6: “he . . . could not brook the wickedness of what had been said, and, besides, had for a long time been pursuing the philosophical life; so he escaped the whole company of the church, and spent many years secretly in the deserts and obscure parts of the country.”

³⁹ *EH*, 6.11.1.

⁴⁰ Eusebius, 6.11.1–2: “ἐπίσκοπον ἐτέρας ὑπάρχοντα παρουκίας,” apparently somewhere in Cappadocia.

⁴¹ Eusebius, 6.11.3.

of Eusebius throughout the work, and is one of the goals listed in his preface.⁴²

Eusebius thus interrupts his main narrative concerning Origen and the Alexandrian church with a discussion of the succession of the sees of Jerusalem and Antioch in 6.9–6.11, yet without listing other sees as is his custom. He is clearly taking pains to sort out the confused situation in the see of Jerusalem, which had one bishop disappear, then return, then had two bishops at once. This is in part why he spent more time on Jerusalem than Antioch in his excursus in 6.9–6.11. The holiness of Narcissus, his steadfastness during the persecution of Severus, and his zeal for the “philosophical life” are noted to forestall any suspicions surrounding his withdrawal in the face of charges against him. Alexander’s journey to Jerusalem and his proclamation as bishop are both attributed to divine intervention through dreams. Furthermore Eusebius cites hard historical evidence in the form of a letter preserved from the archives of the library of Caesarea.⁴³ It is clearly important to him to establish the proper succession of Alexander to the see of Jerusalem.

The reason for Eusebius’ dwelling on the Jerusalem situation becomes apparent in his later discussion of Origen. In 6.19.15 Origen is called to a disputation in Arabia. While away from Alexandria, “no small warfare broke out in the city.”⁴⁴ As a result of the instability in Alexandria Origen “secretly” proceeded to Caesarea in Palestine. He is requested by the bishops there to teach and to preach, though he had not been ordained presbyter. Eusebius defends this action by quoting from a letter attributed to Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and Theoctistus, bishop of Caesarea. In response to the critique of Demetrius of Alexandria, these two bishops defend their actions by citing similar examples of lay persons preaching in other churches. Though he resumes his work in Alexandria, Origen later stops in Caesarea on his return from Greece, and “received the laying-on of hands for the presbyterate at Caesarea from the

⁴² Eusebius, 1.1.1: “the number of those who were distinguished in the provinces of greatest fame.” The “provinces” are in fact bishoprics. The Greek word is παροικία, used in the *Ecclesiastical History* as the areas over which bishops preside.

⁴³ Or perhaps Jerusalem—although in 6.11.3 Eusebius describes the letter as preserved “with us,” in 6.20.1 he also mentions the library at Aelia which Alexander had gathered, leaving the possibility that the letter was preserved in the archives of Jerusalem.

⁴⁴ As a result of Caracalla’s attack on the citizens of Alexandria.

bishops there.” Eusebius then goes on to explain that a fuller description and defense of the actions of these bishops,

as well as the other contribution he [Origen] made . . . require a separate composition, and we have given a fairly full account of them in the second book of the *Apology* that we have written on his behalf.⁴⁵

Establishing an unquestioned succession of Alexander to the see of Jerusalem fulfills one of Eusebius’ stated goals concerning episcopacy in the *Ecclesiastical History*. However, it just as importantly fulfills one of his unstated goals: defending Origen and the school of Caesarea. Eusebius shows the unquestioned orthodoxy, legitimacy, and succession of a bishop who ordained Origen as well as defended his teaching as a layman.

After establishing the proper timeframe for Origen’s move to Caesarea in 6.26, and the succession of Heraclas to the see of Alexandria, Eusebius returns to a description of Origen’s work in Palestine. In doing so, Eusebius begins a second phase of his historical apologetic: noting the subsequent actions of the persons involved in the school of Caesarea. The first two main proponents of this school were the bishops Theoctistus of Caesarea and Alexander of Jerusalem, both described as “attending on him [Origen] the whole time as their only teacher.”⁴⁶ Alexander is honored with a martyr’s death under the Decian persecution in 6.39. Just as significant is the involvement of these prominent bishops was the recruitment of the next generation of leaders of the church. In 6.30 Eusebius tells us that while Origen was teaching in Caesarea, “many came to him, not only the natives, but also numbers of foreign pupils.” Specifically Eusebius mentions a certain Theodore, along with Gregory Thaumaturgus and his brother Athenodore. Eusebius also notes that Gregory and Athenodore “were deemed worthy of the episcopate in the churches of Pontus”⁴⁷ in spite of their youth, because of their work with Origen.

This apologetic element continues in Book 7 of the *Ecclesiastical History*. The last chapters of Book 6 and the beginning of Book 7

⁴⁵ Eusebius, 6.23.4.

⁴⁶ Eusebius, 6.27.1: “τὸν πάντα χρόνον προσανέχοντες αὐτῷ, οἵα διδασκάλω μόνῳ.”

⁴⁷ Eusebius, 6.30.1: “ώς ἔτι νέους ἄμφω ἐπισκοπῆς τῶν κατὰ Πόντον ἐκκλησιῶν ἀξιωθῆναι.”

are concerned with matters pertaining to the Decian persecution, in particular the Novatian schism. For much of his discussion concerning Novatian and the Decian-Valerian persecution Eusebius relied on the letters of Dionysius, which in part explains his lack of reference to the school of Caesarea.⁴⁸ Eusebius picks up his narrative concerning the school of Origen again in 7.14. After describing the cessation of the persecution, and including Valerian's rescript, Eusebius devotes a chapter to the status of the important bishoprics. After noting the holders of the sees of Rome and Antioch, Eusebius tells us that Firmilian, last mentioned in 6.27, was still bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia.⁴⁹ He also notes that Gregory and Athenodore were still bishops in Pontus, and explicitly notes that "they were pupils of Origen."⁵⁰ After the death of Theotictus of Caesarea, a certain Domnus became bishop, and after a short reign was followed by "Theotecnus, our contemporary." Eusebius also informs us that "he was of the school of Origen."⁵¹ In 7.14 Eusebius again combines one of his stated goals in writing the history with one of his evident, if unstated, goals. In updating the list of the bishops of important sees, he included with them important members of the school of Origen and their respective sees.

The alumni of the school of Origen have an important role to play in Book 7 of the *Ecclesiastical History*. Just as establishing the orthodoxy and legitimacy of bishops such as Narcissus was an element in defending Origen, so does the legacy of Origen have an important role in establishing the prestige of the disciples of the school of Caesarea. After his interlude on the pupils of Origen who had advanced to the episcopacy, Eusebius spends several chapters

⁴⁸ Eusebius acknowledges his reliance on Dionysius in 7.1.1: "In the composition of the seventh book of the *Ecclesiastical History* Dinoysius, the great bishop of the Alexandrians, will again assist us in our task by his own words . . . by means of the letters he has left behind." Gustave Bardy, in his work *Paul de Samosate* (Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Louvaniense, Études et Documents, 1929), notes that one of the reasons Eusebius included Dionysius as a source, apart from any discussion of his Origenism, was that in his letters he provided a precedent for the eventual deposition of Paul of Samosata in a letter inviting him to attend a Synod in Antioch to judge certain Novatian bishops (*EH*, 6.46.3; Bardy, 284).

⁴⁹ In 6.27 Eusebius informs us that Firmilian "displayed such esteem for Origen, that at one time he would summon him to his own parts for the benefit of the churches; at another, himself journey to Judaea . . ."

⁵⁰ Eusebius, 7.14: "Ωριγένους γνώριμοι."

⁵¹ Eusebius, 7.14: "τῆς δὲ Ωριγένους διατριβῆς καὶ οὗτος ἦν."

in Book 7 on the writings of Dionysius, concerning such matters as the dating of Easter and the status of the book of Revelation. Eusebius finally finishes with Dionysius as a source, marking a new section beginning in 7.26.3: “so much for Dionysius.” Leaving him behind, Eusebius begins the discussion of recent history, moving from the more remote past to narrating events of his own time. In doing so Eusebius again invokes a technical vocabulary used throughout the *Ecclesiastical History*. Using a horatory subjunctive he announces that he is going to hand down, παραδώμεν, “for the information of posterity the character of our own generation.”⁵² This marks an official beginning of events which Eusebius deems to be contemporary. In doing so he uses the language of handing down and of succession, words which have been important ones in the *Ecclesiastical History*. Eusebius speaks of succession in regards to both of apostolic teaching and of the bishops of important sees, as stated in the prologue.⁵³ He now uses that same language to introduce the history of his own contemporaries, and moves into a lengthy discussion of the events surrounding the rise and fall of Paul of Samosata.

Following this language of succession Eusebius recounts the confrontation between the successors of the school of Caesarea with Paul of Samosata and his followers. U.M. Lang has examined the extant fragments of the Council and identified the positions of Paul and of his opponents.⁵⁴ Lang’s concerns are primarily with the theological issues discussed rather than with the historical events:

I shall not be concerned with the ecclesio-political and historical circumstances of this crisis; rather, I am interested in what Paul actually

⁵² Eusebius, 7.26.3.

⁵³ Contained in 1.1.1, the very first sentence of the work, “τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχάς . . .” On this theme in Eusebius, see Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian*, 45–59. For a larger discussion of the establishment of a succession of authority in Christianity, see Le Boulluec, *La notion d’hérésie*.

⁵⁴ U.M. Lang, “The Christological Controversy at the Synod of Antioch in 268/269,” *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS, Vol. 51 (2000), 54–80. See also Fergus Millar, “Paul of Samosata, Zenobia, and Aurelian: the Church, Local Culture, and the Political Allegiance in Third-Century Syria,” *Journal of Religious Studies* 61 (1971), 1–17. For background on Paul, see Henri de Riedmatten, *Les actes du procès de Paul de Samosate: étude sur la christologie du III^e–IV^e siècles* (Fribourg: Editions St. Paul, 1952), and Robert Lynn Sample, *The Messiah as Prophet: the Christology of Paul of Samosata*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Northwestern University, 1977.

taught so as to provoke his condemnation, especially in the properly christological aspect of the controversy at the Antiochene synod.⁵⁵

My concern is to show that Eusebius' presentation of the Council of Antioch emerged from his concern to advance the fortunes of the school of Caesarea. In 7.27 Eusebius again has one of his chapters concerning the important bishoprics, noting the successor to Xystus in Rome. After the death of Demetrian of Antioch, "Paul of Samosata received the episcopate." According to Eusebius Paul, contrary to the teaching of the Church, taught that Christ was "in his nature an ordinary man."⁵⁶ In response to Paul's opinions a synod was called to meet in Antioch. Eusebius does not tell us who called it, only that Dionysius, due to his age and poor health, was unable to attend, and that "the rest of the pastors of the churches" hurried to Antioch. In 7.28 Eusebius gives us a list of these bishops, and the first three mentioned are prominent disciples of Origen: Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia, and Gregory and Athenodore from Pontus. Along with the bishops of Tarsus, Iconium, and Jerusalem, Theotecnus, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, also attended.⁵⁷

Also in attendance at the Antiochene synod were unnamed supporters of Paul. Eusebius makes it clear that there were at least two parties debating at the council. The first were the followers of Paul of Samosata, τῶν ἀμφὶ τὸν Σαμοσατέα, and the other consisted of those who wanted to bring his supposed heterodoxy into the open. This second group, according to Eusebius, contained countless throngs of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, but that the bishops he mentioned "were the most famous among them." The synod in Antioch, then, would seem to be some sort of confrontation between a group of bishops whose leading members were alumni of the school of Origen, and a group of followers of the new bishop of Antioch, perhaps representing certain elements of Syriac Christianity.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Lang, 54. Lang's comment again demonstrates how history is often uncritically used to provide context for theological reconstructions; see Chapter 1, footnote 14.

⁵⁶ Eusebius, 7.27.2, "ώς κοινοῦ τὴν φύσιν ἀνθράπου γενομένου."

⁵⁷ For a dated but thorough analysis of the Synod of Antioch, see Gustave Bardy, *Paul de Samosate*, 283–316.

⁵⁸ Bardy fails to appreciate the connection between the bishops mentioned throughout Books 6–7 and the Antiochene synod. He argues that the list of bishops in 7.28 has to do with the fact that the issues involved affected only those bishops who

This first council apparently ended with no firm conclusion. A second synod was held in 268, as Eusebius informs us in 7.29.1: “In Aurelian’s day a final synod of an exceedingly large number of bishops was assembled.”⁵⁹ Again there are prominent bishops in this council with connections to Origen and Caesarea.⁶⁰ However the manner of disputation in this second Antiochene synod is different from the first. Lang demonstrates that the Synod of 268 was conducted in a manner peculiar to the third century, when the office of teacher held particular prominence, and had not been entirely subsumed into the presbyterate.⁶¹ In such a council the accused engaged in a dialogue with a prominent teacher who attempted to refute and reconcile him. An example of such a council can be found in the *Ecclesiastical History*. In an incident concerning Origen and another group of bishops, Eusebius describes a disputation between Beryllus and Origen 6.32.⁶² Like Origen, Malchion is a prominent teaching presbyter: Eusebius tells us that he is learned (*λόγιος*), head of a school in Antioch, and had been deemed worthy of the presbyterate. Like the confrontation between Origen and Beryllus, Malchion

were involved with the see of Antioch: “l’affaire d’Antioche ne s’ébruita pas tout de suite en dehors de l’Orient; ceux-là seuls s’y intéressèrent qui étaient en relations avec la métropole syrienne (Bardy, 284).” He does discuss the connection between the Palestinian/Cappadocian bishops (288–290), but does not see the matter as a confrontation between rival schools of thought as I argue. Rather, despite Eusebius’ apology for Origen and his efforts to connect these bishops with the school of Caesarea, Bardy operates from the perspective that the bishops converged in Antioch without any connections to various schools, concerned only with their duties as bishops in preserving the faith: “Les évêques appelés en concile n’y venaient pas comme docteurs privés pour défendre des opinions personnelles. Ils venaient comme témoins de la foi, comme gardiens de la vérité. Les divergences d’écoles pouvaient-elles compter en face de la grandeur d’une telle mission (Bardy, 290)?”

⁵⁹ It is not altogether clear in Eusebius that he is speaking of two different councils. Yet he clearly tells us that Firmilian of Cappadocia has to travel to Antioch twice, although he dies without attending the second synod (*EH*, 7.30.4–5).

⁶⁰ Foremost among these include: Helenus, a correspondent of Dionysius of Alexandria, who invited Dinoysiis to a synod in Antioch to deal with Novatian bishops (*EH*, 6.46.3), and who is mentioned in a letter from Dionysius in 7.5.1 along with Theoctistus of Caesarea and Firmilian of Cappadocia; Theotecnus, the bishop of Caesarea; and Malchion, the presbyter who functioned as the interlocutor and spokesperson for the school of Origen. Many of the names unknown to us apart from Eusebius (Theophilus, Proclus, Aelianus, Paul, Bolanus, Hierax, Eutyches, and Theodore). In addition we know that the see of Alexandria was represented by two followers of Dionysius, Eusebius and Antatolius (*EH*, 7.32.8, 7.32.13).

⁶¹ Lang, 62–63.

⁶² Another example is the *Dialogue with Heraclides*, ed. J. Scherer, *Entretien d’Origène avec Héraclide*, SC 67 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1960).

unmasks the heretic Paul in a public debate before a synod of bishops.⁶³ Thus in Eusebius' account the heirs of Origen's theological traditions have their own Origen to assist them in unmasking heresy. There are significant differences between earlier synods and this one, however. Beryllus was confounded, corrected, and allowed to remain part of the church. This is not the case with Paul.

The council composed a letter to be sent to Dionysius of Rome and Maximus of Alexandria to announce their findings and decisions. The bulk of the synodal letter is concerned with outlining improper behavior by Paul rather than doctrinal error. They do charge that Paul has “departed from the canon,”⁶⁴ but a series of personal accusations against the bishop follows. They speculate on the sources of his sudden wealth, charge that he asked to be addressed as *ducenarius* rather than ἐπίσκοπος, accuse him of behaving more like a sophist than a bishop, and allege that instead of chanting Psalms he trained choirs of women to sing hymns to him instead. It is only towards the end of the letter, having listed these and other behaviors, that the bishops follow up on their doctrinal accusations. They accuse him of following the “abominable heresy of Artemas,” who is described as Paul of Samosata’s father (in heresy, presumably). This is the lone theological statement contained in the synodal letter as Eusebius transmits it to us.⁶⁵ Given that the heresy of Artemas is nowhere explained in the synodal letter, this would appear to be a reference to 5.28.1 of the *Ecclesiastical History*.⁶⁶ Here Eusebius discusses a treatise written by an anonymous Christian against the heresy of a certain Artemon.⁶⁷ In 5.28 Artemon’s heresy is explicitly described as that “which Paul of Samosata has tried to renew in our own

⁶³ See Eusebius, 6.33.2, “ἐπὶ τούτῳ πλείστων ἐπισκόπων;” the gathering in Beryllus is referred to as a σύνοδος in 33.3. Compare with 7.29.1, “πλείστων ὅσων ἐπισκόπων συνόδουν.”

⁶⁴ 7.30.6; the LCL editors add “of truth” in brackets despite the fact that it does not appear in the Greek text.

⁶⁵ There is a parenthetical statement in 7.30.11 which charges that Paul “is not willing to acknowledge with us that the Son of God has come down from heaven, to anticipate something of what we are about to write . . .”

⁶⁶ This does not preclude that Eusebius has left out a discussion of Artemas in his quotations from the synodal letters. He abridges the letter on several occasions, though not in the concluding section which mentions the connection between Artemas and Paul.

⁶⁷ Though the charge is that Paul of Samosata considered Christ to be a man links the two passages, the names are different. In 5.28.1 the heretic is Ἀρτέμων, in the genitive Ἀρτέμωνος; in 7.30.16 Ἀρτέμας, genitive Ἀρτεμᾶ.

time . . . which claims the savior was a mere man.” Lang’s analysis of the fragments of the Antiochene council demonstrates that the conflict centered around the understanding of the union between the Logos and the human body as paralleling that of individual human nature and the Soul, drawn from the teachings of Origen, an analogy which Paul of Samosata rejected.⁶⁸

The council then took a precipitous step. Paul was excommunicated, and the bishops assembled appointed a new bishop of Antioch. The bishop chosen was a certain Domnus, whose father before him had held the see. Supported by bishops from the school of Origen, and unmasked by a presbyter ordained in Antioch and head of the rhetorical school in Antioch, Paul was deposed and the bishopric was kept in the family, as it were, with the son of a previous bishop chosen. Yet Paul did not yield, refusing to vacate the church in Antioch. The emperor Aurelian was petitioned, and ruled that the building should belong “to those whom the bishops of the doctrine in Italy and Rome should communicate in writing.”⁶⁹

The school of Origen thus played an important role in Books 6 and 7 of the *Ecclesiastical History*. Not only did Eusebius include an apology for the school, he also noted the prominent place that bishops and teaching presbyters associated with the school took in the church. One of the important, though unstated, elements of Eusebius’ telling of history was defending the legacy and traditions of his theological school. In Books 8–10 of the *Ecclesiastical History* Eusebius likewise shows his indebtedness to the school of Origen.

III. BOOK 10 OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY: HISTORY THROUGH THE LENS OF ORIGEN

Ancient and modern authors are united in rare agreement in their disdain for the historical content of Book 10 of the *Ecclesiastical History*. I have already noted the critiques of Socrates and Rufinus in the prefaces to their works.⁷⁰ The most recent modern works on the *Ecclesiastical History* have focused largely on determining textual and chronological questions, and as such Book 10 does not figure

⁶⁸ Lang, 74–79.

⁶⁹ Eusebius, *EH*, 7.30.19.

⁷⁰ See above, 19–24.

prominently, if at all.⁷¹ For example, Robert M. Grant, in his *Eusebius as Church Historian*, focused on Books 1–7 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, looking at the themes elucidated in the prologue and tracing how Eusebius shaped and rewrote his material to reflect them. Grant explicitly does not deal with the later books, referring to a separate historiographical tradition which has focused on examining the changes made in the concluding books (e.g., the deletion of the name of Crispus, and the relationship between Books 8–9 to the *Martyrs of Palestine*, among other questions) and their significance for the history of the Constantinian period.⁷² Grant reflects the scholarly consensus that there is little to bind Books 1–7, written as a unit and completed by the beginning of the third century, with Books 8–10, composed during the period of the Great Persecution. Timothy Barnes, in *Constantine and Eusebius*, critically examined Books 8–9 of the *Ecclesiastical History* as well as the *Life of Constantine*, *Against Marcellus*, and other works of Eusebius in order to untangle the complicated web of events during the years 305–337, from Constantine's accession to power to his death. Both authors share Rufinus' and Socrates' disdain of Book 10. Grant is not concerned with Book 10. Inherent in his work is the assumption that in Book 10 Eusebius does not treat themes which are brought up and discussed in Books 1–7. While Grant's methodological concerns have led him to exclude a discussion of Book 10, the time period which it encompasses is precisely the focus of Barnes' work. In discussing Book 10, Barnes summarized the panegyric and faulted it for its chronological and historical errors. He noted that it

equates the policies of Constantine with those of Licinius, the policies of Maxentius with those of Maximinus . . . the equation implies an ignorance of realities. Eusebius repeats a stereotype, a conventional opinion, a comforting simplification of the truth.⁷³

⁷¹ As noted in the introduction, Glenn Chesnut approaches Eusebius from a thematic perspective, showing the continuity and discontinuity of Christian history with Graeco-Roman historiography (for example examining themes such as the role of fortune in history). He briefly mentions Book 10, but only in a discussion of Eusebius' interpretation of traditions of Hellenistic kingship in his praises of Constantine (168, 170).

⁷² Robert M. Grant, *Eusebius as Church Historian* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980), 1–2; also 164. D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, in *Eusebius of Caesarea* (London: Mowbray, 1960), writes of the closing books that “the virtues and faults of his writing are flaunted almost vulgarly, the moreso after the seventh book (167).”

⁷³ Timothy D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 163. Hollerich does devote some

Rather than faulting him for errors in chronology, one should ask instead what Eusebius's intentions were in writing Book 10, how he wrote it, and how it fits in with the overall structure and argument of the *Ecclesiastical History*. In short, to subject Book 10 to the examination and scrutiny that has been applied to Books 1–7 and 8–9.

A close reading of Book 10 of the *Ecclesiastical History* directly contradicts these assumptions by Barnes and Grant. By taking into account the way in which Eusebius develops themes treated elsewhere in Books 1–9, Book 10 provides not only a clue to the interpretation of Books 8–9, but of Eusebius' overall purposes in composing the entire *Ecclesiastical History*. Book 10 combines concerns expressed in Books 1–7 and Books 8–9. This is done by interpreting the persecution, the central theme of Books 8–9, through the lens of an exegetical method derived from the school of Origen, the defense of which was a central apologetic element of Books 6–7.

The first task is to begin by setting Book 10 within the overall structure of the *Ecclesiastical History*. As scholarship has shown, Books 1–7 form a distinct unit, perhaps completed as early as 295. Books 8–9 form a second unit of the work, composed at roughly the same time as a description of the persecution under Diocletian, Galerius, and Maximinus. The original Book 8 of the *History* consisted of what is designated as Eusebius' *Martyrs of Palestine*, with Book 9 recounting the resumption of the persecution under Maximinus. Book 8, however, was further edited to its current form, and appeared after the persecution in an edition of the *Ecclesiastical History*, with Book 9 largely intact from the previous edition. Book 10.1–7 was then added, ending with the Imperial legislation of Constantine concerning the restoration of the church. Another edition included the eventual victory of Constantine over Licinius, and later editions appeared with minor editorial changes, such as the deleting of the name of Crispus following his execution.⁷⁴ The details of textual composition are not my primary concern. What is essential is to note that Eusebius was re-editing Book 8 at the same time that he was compiling Book 10, and subsequently that the current form of Books 8–10 represent

attention to Book 10, yet views it solely through the lense of Eusebius' theology of the episcopacy; see Hollerich, 179. Wallace-Hadrill, in his chapter on the *Ecclesiastical History*, does not even mention Book 10!

⁷⁴ See footnote 36.

Eusebius's final thoughts on the presentation of the persecution within the *Ecclesiastical History*.

There are certain elements to keep in mind before beginning an examination of Book 10. First of all we are encountering a different form of writing history, which requires a different methodology. Book 10 is overwhelmingly devoted to quotations from other sources, the longest of which comes from Eusebius himself. The details and rhetorical twists and turns of Eusebius's argument in the Panegyrical Oration are therefore crucial to an understanding of Book 10. Such an analysis has simply not been done, as the book has tended to be interpreted through an historical framework. Second, with Book 10 the reader is entering the increasingly recent present. Books 8–9 take us to another level of Eusebius's involvement in the text, describing "the events of our own day (8.1)," with the author inserting himself as a witness in 8.7.2: "we ourselves were present when these things were happening." Book 10 thus completes this movement into the present for both the Caesarean circle of Origen and for the author. Eusebius, as the latest member of the Caesarean circle to be advanced into the episcopacy, takes center stage in the history. Retracing much of the foregoing is essential to a reappraisal of Book 10. Eusebius's connection with the school of Caesarea, Pamphilus, and Origen, as described in Books 6–7, comes to the fore in his presentation of the development of the church and interpretation of the Great Persecution.

Given the centrality of the Great Persecution in Books 8–10 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, the image of the church presented in Book 8 is another element in understanding Book 10. As noted above, Book 8 originally consisted of Eusebius's *Martyrs of Palestine*, and, combined with Book 9, constituted a second edition of the *Ecclesiastical History*. A third edition, with the edited version of Book 8 and Book 10.1–7, appeared roughly in 315, after Eusebius's advancement to the episcopacy (since he was a bishop at the consecration of the church at Tyre) dated by mention of the Council of Arles in 10.5.23, held in 314. For this final edition Eusebius chose to have the *Martyrs of Palestine* appear as a separate work, with a selection of various martyrdoms replacing the *Martyrs of Palestine*. Eusebius supplied these select martyrdoms in Book 8 with an historical framework.

Book 8 begins with a prelude in 8.1–8.2.3, describing the causes of the persecution. Eusebius presents an image of peace reigning throughout the empire, for Greeks as well as barbarians (8.1.1). In particular the Christian church prospered as a result of this peace,

with prominent Christians serving as governors, and even serving in the imperial palace itself. The churches were blessed with throngs of faithful believers (8.1.5), and built marvelous structures. For Eusebius, however, it was precisely this freedom (*ἐπὶ πλέον ἐλευθερίας*, 8.1.7) which caused dissension between the Christians, who were embroiled in envy and turned against one another: “we fell to envy and fierce railing against one another.”⁷⁵ As a result of these internal squabbles, the Christian community split into various factions, with the leaders providing no better example than the laity: “rulers attacked rulers and laity formed factions against laity.”⁷⁶

The behavior of Christians grows even worse. In 8.1.8 Eusebius describes them as little better than pagan atheists, the reversal of a charge originally leveled against the Christians.⁷⁷ Likewise the behavior of the leaders, the bishops of the churches, becomes equally abominable. In 8.1.8 Eusebius reinforces the appropriate role of bishops by calling them shepherds (*ποιμήν* as opposed to *ἄρχων*), and accuses them of becoming little better than the persecutors of Christianity themselves. They are described as so engrossed in their own rivalries for power (*φιλονεικία*), that they claim “with all vehemence the objects of their ambition as if they were a despot’s spoils.”⁷⁸ The word used here is *τυραννίδας*, a link which Eusebius forges to connect Christians with the persecutors themselves. The *τυραννίδας* of 8.1.8 is used again to describe the behavior of later emperors.⁷⁹ Eusebius also describes the members of church “warring upon ourselves (*προσπολεμούντων*)” further linking Christians with their persecutors. The understanding of the persecution as a war against the Christians by the Romans is a particular theme of Eusebius, as shown, for example, in 8.13.9: “Now as concerns the state of the Roman government before the war against us . . .”⁸⁰ The shepherds,

⁷⁵ Eusebius intensifies the completeness of the envy which Christians had, combining the prefix διὰ with the verb φθονέω: ἄλλων ἄλλοις διαφθονομένων, 8.1.7.

⁷⁶ “ἄρχοντων τε ἄρχουσι προστηγούντων καὶ λαῶν ἐπὶ λαοὺς καταστασιαζόντων,” 8.1.7.

⁷⁷ For Christians being accused of “atheism,” see Eusebius, 4.15.6, 4.15.18–20, and 4.16.3.

⁷⁸ “οἵα τε τυραννίδας τὰς φιλαρχιάς ἐκθύμως διεκδικοῦντες . . .”

⁷⁹ The word is used in reference to both Maxentius and Maximin. For Eusebius’ use of the word in connection with the persecutors of Christians, see 8.14.1, 8.14.3, 8.14.5, 8.14.6, 8.14.7, 8.14.14, 8.14.16, 8.14.17, 8.14.18, and 9.10.12.

⁸⁰ For additional reference to persecution as a “war,” see 1.1.2, 8.4.1, 8.13.18, 8.16.2, 9.1.2, and 9.3.1.

in Eusebius's revision, are as bad as the tyrants, and the Christians are as bad as their own persecutors.

Eusebius's editorial changes to Book 8 are immediately reflected in the opening chapters of Book 10. Like Book 8, Book 10 begins with a historical prelude. Whereas in Book 8 this introduction served to explain the reasons for the persecution, in Book 10 Eusebius reverses that understanding, showing the peace and unity of the restored Christian church. The world has been freed of the tyrants, and peace is once again the state of affairs within the empire. Just as Christian and non-Christian alike benefited from the peace which prevailed prior to the persecution,⁸¹ so did everyone share in the joys of deliverance:

And now henceforth a day bright and radiant . . . shone down upon the churches of Christ throughout the whole word; nor were even those outside our society grudged, if not equal enjoyment of our divinely-sent blessings, at any rate a share in their effluence and a participation thereof.⁸²

In 10.2.1, Eusebius notes that each person “after his own fashion” gave thanks to God. Yet it was the Christians who benefited the most: for they not only shared in the deliverance of all people from oppression but also saw the restoration of their churches.

It is precisely the reconstruction of the church buildings torn down during the persecution that will become for Eusebius the operative image of the post-persecution church, and the occasion for his oration in 10.4. In 10.3 he discusses the gathering of the people in Tyre for the dedication of the rebuilt church. It is this gathering which counterbalances the presentation of the church in 8.1–8.2.3. Instead of *λαῶν ἐπὶ λαοὺς καταστασιαζόντων* as in 8.1.7, the faithful are described as “*λαῶν ἐπὶ λαοὺς φιλοφρονήσεις* (10.3.1).” The *στάσις* of 8.1.7 is instead replaced by *φρόνησις*. Instead of dissension there is harmony and unity, and in his description of the restored church Eusebius echoes the description of the apostolic church of the Book of Acts. The Jerusalem church is described throughout the opening chapters of Acts as marked by unity of action and purpose, as in

⁸¹ Eusebius, 8.1.1: “It is beyond our powers to describe in a worthy manner the measure and nature of that honour as well as freedom which was accorded to all men, both Greeks and barbarians . . .”

⁸² Eusebius, 10.1.8.

Acts 2:1 and 2:46. Eusebius quotes Acts directly in 10.3.3, emphasizing that “all were of one soul, and displayed the same zeal for the faith.”⁸³

With the resorted church likened to the church of the apostles, Eusebius steps forward at this point in his narrative, personally witnessing the restored church, just as he had personally witnessed the church at its lowest point in Book 8. The Panegyrical Oration in 10.4.1–72 is the longest quotation in the *Ecclesiastical History* and central to Eusebius’s continued interpretation of the post-persecution church. The reconstructed church buildings will serve for Eusebius as a symbol of the restored church, a symbol best understood through the tools of biblical exegesis which were handed down to him through Origen’s influence on the school of Caesarea. In doing so, Eusebius’s vision is best understood within the context of the *History* as whole, as he plays with the categories and vocabulary which he has created throughout the various editions of the work.

Eusebius begins the oration with the standard praise and thanksgiving. Yet the discussion of the saving actions of the triumphant Lord leads into an extensive biblical exegesis which touches upon Paulinus, the church building itself, individual Christians, and finally the human soul. Eusebius appropriates images from Origen’s homiletical works, key theological principles, as well as exegetical style and overall understanding of the role of Scriptural exegesis within the Christian life.

Following his introduction Eusebius returns to that fruit of Paulinus’s actions, the church building at Tyre. Alongside the physical structure which has been constructed there also exists the living temple of God constructed from the Christian people: “The living temple, then, of a living God formed out of ourselves.”⁸⁴ Appropriating an image from the Epistle of the Hebrews (which Eusebius has been particularly zealous to show in the *History* as an authentic Pauline epistle),⁸⁵ into this living temple only the great High Priest, Christ,

⁸³ The key comparison here is the stress on the unity of the community. In 10.3.3 Eusebius describes the community as “of one mind,” ὁμοθυμαδόν. This word is used to describe the apostolic church in the opening chapters of the Book of Acts. See Acts 2:46, 4:32, and 8:6.

⁸⁴ Eusebius, 10.4.22.

⁸⁵ Eusebius discusses the place of Hebrews in the canon in 3.3.2–2–7, 3.28.1–2, 5.26, 6.14.4, 6.20.3, 6.25.11–14, arguing for its authenticity and citing various sources to support this.

can rightfully see. Paulinus takes second place to Christ as High Priest: “if not in the first at any rate in the second place, to behold and inspect the inmost recesses of your souls.”⁸⁶ Eusebius’ subsequent exegesis emerges from his background in the school of Caesarea and the exegetical works of Origen. Rather than exegeting a written work, a λόγος, Eusebius draws from categories in Origen to describe Paulinus’ construction of the physical structure of the restored Christian church. Following Christ as a second High Priest, Paulinus looks to Christ’s deeds as “patterns and archetypes.”⁸⁷ Similarly, Origen presented a biblical hermeneutic whereby images from the Hebrew Scriptures represented types and shadows of the deeper meaning within Scripture, drawing from 1 Corinthians 10:2 and Hebrews 8:5. For Origen there were three levels of understanding: the level of the flesh, of the soul, and of the spirit, as described in *On First Principles*:

one must therefore portray the meaning of the sacred writings in a three fold way upon one’s own soul, so that the simple man may be edified by what we may call the flesh (*carnis*, σάρπε) of Scripture, this name being given to the obvious interpretation; while the man who has made some progress may be edified by its soul, as it were; and the man who is perfect . . . may be edified by the spiritual (*πνευματικῆ*; *spiritualis*) law.⁸⁸

For Origen it is through the spiritual meaning that Scripture begins to transcend its actual, physical meaning, and the deeper meaning becomes clearer, which is the ideal goal of the believer:

But it is a spiritual explanation when one is able to show of what kind of “heavenly things” the Jews “after the flesh” served a copy and a shadow, and of what “good things to come” the law has a “shadow.” And, speaking generally, we have . . . to seek after the “wisdom in a mystery, even the wisdom that hath been hidden . . .”⁸⁹

The appropriate biblical quotation concerning the copy and shadow which the Jews “after the flesh” served is Hebrews 8:5, which Origen took as justification for his understanding of the spiritual under-

⁸⁶ Eusebius, 10.4.24.

⁸⁷ EH 10.4.25: “ώς ἂν ἀρχετύποις χρώμενος παραδείγμασιν.”

⁸⁸ *On First Principles*, 4.2.4, trans. G.W. Butterworth, *Origen: On First Principles* (Gloucester, MA; Peter Smith, 1973), 275–76.

⁸⁹ *On First Principles* 4.2.6; Butterworth, 279. See also *On First Principles* 3.6.8, where Origen uses the same passage from Hebrews to describe those who “labor under the law.”

standing of Scripture. Hebrews 8:5 concerns the building of the tabernacle:

they serve a copy and shadow of the heavenly sanctuary; for when Moses was about to erect the tabernacle, he was instructed by God, saying ‘See that you make everything according to the pattern (*κατὰ τὸν τύπον*) which was shown you on the mountain.’

What is central to Origen is the correct interpretation of the pattern, the *τύπος*, of Scripture.

Rather than Moses, for Eusebius Paulinus is Belzalel, the one whom God chose as the actual artisan who constructed the tabernacle.⁹⁰ Eusebius chooses Belzalel rather than Moses because he is interpreting Origen’s teaching in a different manner. For Origen, the *τύπος* referred to the cultic practices of the Jews, which is clearly his referent in *On First Principles* 3.6.8 and 2.6.3. For Eusebius, discerning the layers of meaning in the restoration of the physical structure of the church is the *τύπος*. Accordingly Belzalel, the artisan who constructed the tabernacle itself, is chosen rather than Moses, the one who received the building instructions. Origen’s concern for refuting the Jews and the Law informs his choice of Moses; Belzalel does not appear in any discussion of the tabernacle in Origen’s work, neither in *On First Principles* nor the *Homilies of Exodus*. Paulinus, through the appropriation of Origen’s exegetical method, is like Belzalel in constructing “the temple of heavenly types in symbolic fashion.”⁹¹

Paulinus’s work does not end with the construction of the church, however. After a description of the church building in 10.4.37–45, there follows in 10.4.46–53 a series of biblical citations, returning to the theme of the restoration of the church, drawn largely from Isaiah. 10.4.53–62 marks a second significant moment for Eusebius, where he again appropriates symbols from Origen in describing this restoration. Referring to the *λόγος* as the Bridegroom, the church building is represented as the bride. This language is taken from the Song of Songs, which Origen interpreted allegorically, taking the Bride to

⁹⁰ Exodus 35:30–35.

⁹¹ 10.4.25, “τῆς τῶν οὐρανίων τύπων διὰ συμβόλων ναοῦ κατασκευῆς.” Hollerich rightly notes the place of Eusebius’ high theology of the episcopate, where the bishop occupies a prominent place in a hierarchical typology; see Hollerich on Paulinus, 179.

be both the church and the soul, almost interchangeably. This is seen, for example in the Prologue to his *Commentary on the Song of Songs*:

The present book of Scripture, then, speaks of this love with which the blessed soul burns and is on fire in regard to the Word of God. And she sings this wedding song through the Spirit, by which the Church is joined and united with its heavenly bridegroom.⁹²

In consecutive sentences Origen speaks of the burning love of the bride for the bridegroom as referring to the soul longing for the Logos, and through singing this song the Church is united to that bridegroom. Both the soul and the church are the bride in Origen's allegorization of the Song of Songs. This language is echoed in 10.4.54, where Eusebius also adopts terminology from the Song of Songs. As he did in assigning him secondary status to Christ the High Priest, Paulinus again plays a facilitating role. Eusebius portrays Paulinus as the νυμφοστόλος, the one assisting the bridegroom and escorting the bride. Paulinus leads the prayers of the church in the song of the Bride to the Bridegroom.⁹³

Eusebius is only beginning to plumb the depths of the images which he is borrowing and adapting. He seeks to dig deeper, to move beyond the plain meanings:

A might wonder truly is this . . . especially in the eyes of such as take heed only to the appearance of outward things.⁹⁴

Those heeding only the outward appearance of the church in Tyre are like those satisfied with the interpretation according to the flesh: it is an imperfect understanding of the symbol. What is greater are the

archetypes, the rational prototypes of these things, and their divine models, I mean the renewal of the God-given, spiritual edifice in our souls.⁹⁵

⁹² Origen, Prologue to the *Commentary on the Song of Songs*; trans. Rowan A. Greer, *Origen* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1979), 230.

⁹³ Eusebius, 10.4.54: "Moreover, since the Bridegroom, even the Word, thus addresseth his Bride, the sacred and Holy Church, fittingly did this paranymph (Paulinus, the νυμφοστόλος) stretch out your hands in the common prayers of all, and awaken and raise up her who was desolate . . ."

⁹⁴ Eusebius, 10.4.55.

⁹⁵ EH, 10.4.55.

Just as for Origen the same words operate on different levels, so they do for Eusebius. Picking up on the understanding of τύπος developed in 10.4.26, Eusebius repeats the word in the compound forms ἀρχέτυπα and πρωτότυπα. This time it refers to a different kind of structure, not a physical one but a psychical one, built in the individual Christian's soul: “ἐν ψυχοῖς οἰκοδομῆς.” The restoration of the soul is the deeper archetype represented by the reconstruction of the church. The parallels of the two types are made plain by Eusebius: like the church the soul is a “holy bride” and a temple.⁹⁶

Moving from developing an understanding of the church to that of the soul, and echoing the language of 10.4.26, in 10.4.57–62 Eusebius uses this image to reinterpret the persecution the church suffered. In 8.1–8.2.3 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius told us that the church brought the persecution upon itself through its own sins, including envy (φθόνος, 8.1.7) and jealousy (ζῆλος, 8.1.8). Here it is on account of the jealousy and envy of diabolical forces that the soul is tempted. Succumbing to this jealousy and envy, the soul, through its own free will chose evil and “fell a tremendous fall.”⁹⁷ This in turn echoes Origen’s concept of the descent of the soul, whereby through free will the pre-existent souls fell from contemplation of the One and on account of their sins were enfleshed in various bodies, depending on the extent of the fall.⁹⁸

Further, just as Eusebius portrays the emperors as the divinely favored saviors of the church in Books 8–9,⁹⁹ he does so again, this time according to a pattern found in Origen’s work. The Logos, seeing the fallen soul, restores the church through the emperors, describing them in terms echoing Origen’s conception of the incarnation. In Eusebius’ oration the Logos appropriates the souls of the Emperors for his purposes:

First, then, choosing for himself the souls of the supreme Emperors, by means of these men most dearly beloved of God he cleansed the whole world of all the wicked and baneful persons and of the cruel God-hating tyrants themselves.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ “νύμφην ἀγίαν καὶ νεὸν πανίερον,” 10.4.56.

⁹⁷ 10.4.57: “ἀλλὰ γάρ φθόνῳ καὶ ζῆλῳ . . . πτῶμα ἔξαισον καταπέπτωκεν.”

⁹⁸ As described in *On First Principles* 1.8.1.

⁹⁹ For example in 9.9.1 both Constantine and Licinius are described as chosen and inspired by God to take up arms against Maxentius and Maximin, respectively.

¹⁰⁰ Eusebius, 10.4.60. With his emphasis on Eusebius’ theology of the episcopate,

In Origen's understanding of the Incarnation, God chose a soul which had not fallen from contemplation of the divine Monad and united it with a human body, as described in *On First Principles* 2.6.3:

But whereas, by reason of the faculty of free will, variety and diversity had taken hold of individual souls, so that one was attached to its author with a warmer and another with a feebler and weaker love, that soul of which Jesus said, “No man taketh from me my soul,” clinging to God from the beginning of creation and ever after in a union inseparable and indissoluble . . . and receiving him wholly . . . was made with him in a pre-eminent degree one spirit . . .¹⁰¹

Eusebius is once again adapting a concept learned from Origen: as the Logos chose the soul which would become the man Jesus as the instrument of salvation, so did the Logos choose the souls of the Emperors.¹⁰²

Eusebius has one last reinterpretation of Origen left in the Panegyrical Oration. Having discussed the church and the soul, he then turns to the Logos as the builder and restorer of the soul, presented according to Origen's understanding of the interpretation of Scripture in guiding the individual Christian to salvation. In accordance with Origen's understanding that different people interpret Scripture on different levels, but that understanding the spiritual level is the ultimate goal, Eusebius describes the Logos in a similar manner in 10.4.63–65. In constructing the physical structure of the church building, the Logos divides the people according to their different abilities in accordance with Origen's levels of understanding Scripture. The “simple” Christians of Origen, those only capable of understanding the text on its lowest level, correspond to those who

Hollerich fails to note this connection between Constantine and the Logos in his discussion of Book 10. For Hollerich on Constantine's place in Book 10, see 191–196.

¹⁰¹ Butterworth translation, 110; see also *On First Principles* 4.4.4: “Now it [the soul of Jesus] was united in a spotless partnership with the Logos of God . . . (Butterworth, 319).”

¹⁰² See also Eusebius' *In Praise of Constantine* for his description of the relationship between the Logos and Constantine. Eusebius employs a wide variety of metaphors, testifying to the unique and close relationship between the Emperor and the Logos. Constantine is described an “interpreter of the Logos of God” (2.4), and an “imitation of the Higher Power” (2.5). Constantine is particularly important in Eusebius' developing theology of Christian kingship. Just as there is one God, and one Logos who revealed that God, so is there one Emperor who leads people to knowledge of God (3.5–6).

fence the outer enclosure with a wall of unerring faith (and this was the great multitude of the people who were unable to support a mightier structure).¹⁰³

Others “he entrusted the entrances to the house,” belonging to a second level of understanding corresponding to Origen’s levels of the soul. In the inner circle are those who understand according the third level of Eusebius’s schema, who are supported “from the innermost mystic teaching of the Scripture.”¹⁰⁴ Paulinus, though portrayed as the builder of the church, as a second High Priest, as escorting the bride to the bridegroom, does so in limited and secondary fashion. The Logos is the ultimate author of salvation.

Eusebius’s Panegyrical Oration is far from being a “conventional opinion, a comforting simplification of the truth.”¹⁰⁵ The Panegyrical Oration stands as an important example of how and why Eusebius created and wove together the various strands of his work; though thoroughly “un”historical by modern standards, the Oration is the centerpiece of *Ecclesiastical History*, for it can only be understood by taking into account concepts developed throughout the work as a whole. In his Oration Eusebius drew together the elements of his personal connection to his material and created a daring and innovative piece of rhetoric which reinterpreted the most important historical event of his lifetime: the Great Persecution under Diocletian and the subsequent restoration of the church under Constantine and Licinius. Eusebius created this vision of the restored church with the tools of Origen’s biblical exegesis, combining the skills learned from his teacher Pamphilus with the language, rhetoric, and discourse developed in his own work. The Panegyrical Oration is not an oversimplification: it is an integral piece in Eusebius’ apology for Origen. Further, it points towards his later historical work, where these themes will be picked up again.

IV. THE COUNCIL OF NICAEA IN THE LIFE OF CONSTANTINE

What of Eusebius’ other oft-maligned foray into writing recent history, the *Life of Constantine*? This work has been held in such low

¹⁰³ Eusebius, 10.4.63.

¹⁰⁴ Eusebius, 10.4.64.

¹⁰⁵ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 163.

repute that, due to the apparent number of historical inaccuracies, for some time the thesis was propounded that it was not written by Eusebius at all, only attributed to him.¹⁰⁶ Historians who accepted the work as Eusebian presented an image of the bishop as a trusted advisor, a simpering sycophant basking in the reflected magnificence of Constantine. Barnes has ably demonstrated that such a picture does not reflect the evidence. He writes that despite the suspicion with which the work has been regarded, “strangely, however, the picture of Eusebius himself which is implicit in the *Life* has usually been taken on trust.”¹⁰⁷ The picture of Eusebius as a trusted advisor is a flawed one. Barnes notes that Constantine and Eusebius rarely met, and that the correspondence between the two that Eusebius claims largely consisted of general letters sent to a number of bishops.¹⁰⁸ The relationship between the two is much more distant, and that if any bishop is to be considered a trusted imperial advisor, the correct choice would be Ossius of Cordoba.

Along with this reconstruction, Barnes also examines questions of form and authorship. Accepting Eusebian authorship, Barnes accounts for the troublesome doublets and historical inaccuracies by arguing that the work was still in a state of revision when Eusebius died, and that he was engaged in the process of modifying a panegyric of the emperor into a larger historical account of Constantine’s role in shaping the Christian church. As such the place of the Council of Nicaea stands as an important event in Eusebius’ proposed description of Constantine’s influence on the church. Despite the importance of his historical reconstruction, Barnes fails to understand the complexity of Eusebius’ method of historical composition, once again in regard to his telling of recent history. In regards to Eusebius’ presentation of the Council of Nicaea in the *Life*, Barnes notes that it is “inartistically divided between two books,”¹⁰⁹ applying a stylistically pejorative description despite the fact he has previously argued

¹⁰⁶ For a discussion of the composition of the *Life*, see Barnes, 265–266, particularly footnotes 63–64. See also Averil Cameron and Stuart G. Hall, *Eusebius: Life of Constantine*, 4–6.

¹⁰⁷ Barnes, 265.

¹⁰⁸ See Barnes, 267, for an analysis of the correspondence between Eusebius and Constantine. For a defense of Constantine’s adherence to Christianity, specifically with regards to his religious policy, see Pierre Maraval, *Le christianisme de Constantin à la conquête arabe* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1997), particularly 327–348.

¹⁰⁹ Barnes, 269.

that the work was under revision at the time of Eusebius' death. He would seem to be holding Eusebius accountable for the timing of his own death and the work of his later editor(s).¹¹⁰

More importantly, Barnes perpetuates the same methods of evaluation as he did with Book 10. Although proper historical chronology is not part of Eusebius' design, Barnes charges that Eusebius

carefully conceals the antecedents and the long history of the Arian controversy before 324 . . . the picture of the Council of Nicaea is deliberately selective.¹¹¹

For Barnes, the rhetoric and language employed by Eusebius in his description of the Council serves to "conceal the extent and importance of the controversy within the Christian church,"¹¹² most likely due to any embarrassment it might have caused to those who participated holding to views which were eventually condemned. In their commentary on the text, Cameron and Hall echo Barnes' rhetoric. They also imply that Eusebius had something to hide in his description of the Council, noting that

his compromised position at the Council of Nicaea . . . made his whole account extremely sensitive, and accounts for some, if not all, of his omissions . . .¹¹³

In correcting the view of Eusebius which had emerged from the *Life of Constantine*, Barnes has done a great service in liberating him from the role of self-serving Constantinian flunky.¹¹⁴ Yet in doing so he has created a portrait of Eusebius as a self-serving obfuscator of the truth in order to cover his own theological position. This revised portrait of the bishop is still on the whole a negative evaluation,

¹¹⁰ See also the discussion in Cameron and Hall, 27–31. They are in general agreement with Barnes, differing only in noting greater diversity in composition.

¹¹¹ Barnes, 269–270.

¹¹² Barnes, 271.

¹¹³ Cameron, 250. They also note that he "typically omits to name Arius" and that "more details are given by other writers, e.g. Socrates and Sozomen (248–249)." Thus they, too, perpetuate the attitude of Barnes in arguing that Eusebius was somehow dishonest in not reduplicating the Nicene version of events written a hundred years later from a different historical context.

¹¹⁴ Hollerich is in agreement with Barnes in expressing the need for a more nuanced understanding of Eusebius' relationship with Constantine. He notes that "Future study of Eusebius should not be misled into seeing the Constantinian literature as the exhaustive expressions of Eusebius' thought, even after the Council of Nicaea."

because it fails to take into account other reasons and motivations for Eusebius to present the events surrounding Nicaea as he did. To describe the Council of Nicaea in the manner which he did in the *Life* was a conscious choice. In addition to pointing out the distinctive elements of the *Life of Constantine*, it is incumbent to demonstrate why Eusebius chose to tell the story in this way, rather than to critique its “historical” worth or self-serving motivations.

If one looks at the two descriptions of the Council in 2.61–2.73 and 3.4–3.23 from the perspectives established in this chapter, a new insight on Eusebius’ work becomes clear. By taking into account the manner in which Eusebius tells history, the treatment of the Council of Nicaea takes on a new dimension. It is utterly consistent with Eusebius’ understanding of the church, persecution, and the role of the state as presented in his works. The state of the church as described in 2.61 is a deliberate reference to the description of the church just prior to the inception of the Diocletian persecution in 8.1 of the *Ecclesiastical History*. Like the pre-Diocletian church, and the restored church in 10.1, the church in Constantine’s time was not menaced by any outward foe, and was characterized by a profound peace and harmony.¹¹⁵ Yet in the midst of this harmony there emerged a spirit of envy:

The spirit of envy was watching to destroy our blessings, which at first crept in unperceived, but soon revelled in the midst of the assemblies of the saints.¹¹⁶

The φθόνος as described in the *Life* echoes the envy which seized the church as described in the *Ecclesiastical History* in 8.1.7 and turned bishops and laity against one another.¹¹⁷ The result of the strife engendered by this envy, as in the *Ecclesiastical History*, is that the bishops are lined up in conflict with one another: “at length it reached the bishops themselves, and arrayed them in angry hostility against

¹¹⁵ See previous discussion in this chapter, 37–40.

¹¹⁶ *Life*, 2.61. Translation by Ernest Cushing Richardson, NPNF, Volume I (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1890), 515. Greek text quoted from *Eusebius Werke: über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*, edited by Friedhelm Winkelmann (Berlin: Akademia Verlag, 1975).

¹¹⁷ One should not assume here that this “spirit of envy” is necessarily a diabolical influence at work—rather it flows from Eusebius’ presentation of the church as necessarily falling into sin when it has too much freedom. See also footnote 131.

each other.”¹¹⁸ In the *Ecclesiastical History* the laity of the church are arrayed against one another in factions mirroring those that were formed among the bishops: “bishops attacked bishops and laity formed factions against laity.”¹¹⁹ In the *Life*, Eusebius tells us that this spirit of envy and division spread to the people, who were divided and inclined towards different groups or factions.¹²⁰ Thus freedom and harmony allowed for sloth and a spirit of envy to enter into the assemblies of the church, producing division within its members in Eusebius’ description of both the pre-Diocletian and pre-“Arian” church. In addition to these parallels the method of conflict is similar. Prior to the Great Persecution the factions warred “with weapons and spears formed of words.” The disruption which began in Alexandria and spread through the church was likewise a battle fought with words; Eusebius describes them as “sparring with words.”¹²¹ In their commentary Cameron and Hall miss this connection entirely, despite noting in their introduction how much Eusebius relied on the *Ecclesiastical History* in his composition of the *Life*.¹²²

Rather than glossing over the complexities of the origin of the “Arian” controversy for his own purposes, Eusebius is drawing from the theology of persecution developed in the *Ecclesiastical History* and applying it to the state of the Constantinian church just prior to Nicaea. The issue for him is not the conflict over ideas, but the fact that there is a conflict at all. He makes that clear in his description of the state of the church and the calling of the Council in 2.62 and following. He includes a lengthy quotation from a letter of Constantine to Alexander and Arius. In this letter Constantine refers to the substance of the disagreement between the two as “truly insignificant, and unworthy of such fierce contention.”¹²³ He assigns blame to both Alexander and Arius: Alexander for asking an “unprofitable question” from his presbyters, and Arius who

¹¹⁸ *Life*, 2.61.3: “συμβάλλει δῆτα τοὺς ἐπισκόπους, στάσιν ἐμβαλὼν.”

¹¹⁹ *EH* 8.1.7: “ἀρχόντων τε ἀρχουσι προσρηγνύντων καὶ λάον ἐπὶ λαοὺς κατασταῖζόντων.”

¹²⁰ *Life*, 2.61.5: “ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ πλήθη κατατεμόμενα, τῶν μὲν ως τούσδε τῶν δὲ θατέροις ἐπικλινομένων.”

¹²¹ *Life*, 2.61.5: “λόγοις διαληκτιζομένους.” Cameron and Hall translation, 115.

¹²² For a discussion of the *Ecclesiastical History* as source for the *Life*, see Cameron and Hall, 14–16. For a discussion of the beginning of his account of the “Arian” controversy, see their commentary, 248.

¹²³ *Life*, 2.68: “ἄγαν εὐτελὴς καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἀξία τῆς τοσαύτης φιλονεικίας ἡ πρόφασις ἐφωράθη.”

inconsiderately insisted on what ought never to have been conceived at all, or if conceived, should have been buried in profound silence.¹²⁴

In Eusebius' presentation in 2.61–2.73, the dissension caused by disagreement is clearly more scandalous than any of the ideas involved. The letter included by Constantine notes that he sees “no new heresy respecting the worship of God.”¹²⁵ Constantine compares the disagreement to those in the Greek philosophical schools, and allows that certain differences are permissible within the community. In a closing paragraph, Eusebius comments on Constantine’s letter and closes Book 2 reiterating the point which he hopes to make concerning the matters in Egypt: that the dissension between the parties is the primary cause for scandal, not the ideas of Arius, and are caused by jealousy within the church itself.

Eusebius develops these ideas in his second presentation of the Council of Nicaea in 3.4–23. At the beginning of Book 3 the edition of the text which we have opens with a description of Constantine’s piety. In 3.4 Eusebius begins a second account of the Council of Nicaea, lending credence to Barnes’ thesis that the work was in a state of revision at the death of the author. This second description mirrors that in Book 2 and echoes the same language Eusebius used in the *Ecclesiastical History*.¹²⁶ He again chooses to describe the situation of the church prior to Nicaea as rent not by the teachings of Arius, but by the same spirit of envy described in 2.61. The disturbances in Egypt are ascribed to a “spirit of envy.”¹²⁷ Furthermore bishops are again in conflict with one another, and rise up against each other, as do the people.¹²⁸ Eusebius, perhaps revealing the panegyric element which Barnes claims was one of his motives in com-

¹²⁴ *Life*, 2.69.1: “ὁ Ἀλέξανδρε . . . μᾶλλον δ’ ὑπὲρ ματαίου τινὸς ζητήσεως μέρους ἡσθάνετο, σύ [τε], ὁ Ἀρειε, τοῦθ’, ὅπερ ἢ μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐνθυμηθῆναι ἢ ἐνθυμηθέεντα σιωπῇ παραδοῦναι προσῆκον ἦν . . .”

¹²⁵ *Life*, 2.70.

¹²⁶ Cameron and Hall choose to see this description of the Council in continuity with Eusebius’ desire to leave out any controversial or embarrassing details. See Cameron and Hall, 257: “The Council of Nicaea had probably been the first occasion on which Eusebius had met Constantine . . . this shows clearly in the account, which he treats as a set-piece, while adopting the familiar method of passing over its awkward features as far as possible in silence.” They further argue that his account is “evasive,” 262.

¹²⁷ *Life*, 3.4: “τοῦ φόβουν βασκανίας.”

¹²⁸ *Life*, 3.4: “προσρηγνυμένων καθ’ ἐκάστην πόλιν ἐπισκόπων ἐπισκόποις, δῆμων τε δῆμοις ἐπανισταμένων καὶ μόνον οὐχὶ συμπληγάσι κατακοπτόντων ἀλλήλους.”

piling the *Life*, chooses a motif from classical mythology to describe the situation. Choosing a colorful example, he compares warring groups of laity and bishops to the rocks of Symplegades, which in the *Odyssey* crash against one another, crushing passing ships in their way. The spirit of envy which brought down the church in 8.1, the same spirit which tempted the soul in 10.4.57, is at work in the church yet again.

Eusebius then invokes an important theme from the *Ecclesiastical History*: that of warfare.¹²⁹ Eusebius employs this language from the *Ecclesiastical History* in his second description of the gathering of Nicaea. Eusebius tells us that when Constantine saw that his letter to the Alexandrian church had failed to bring about a resolution, he resolved “to prosecute to the utmost this war¹³⁰ against the secret adversary¹³¹ who was disturbing the peace of the church.” Keeping with this war-like theme, Eusebius describes the choice of Nicaea as appropriate, given that its name stands for victory.¹³²

In describing the gathering of the council in 3.7–8 and its eventual resolution of the conflict in 3.19–20, Eusebius again picks up language set forth in the *Ecclesiastical History*, in this case his description of the state of the post-persecution church. The methods of theological discourse learned from the school of Caesarea are again applied. For Eusebius the restored church completely undid and corrected the sins of the pre-persecution church. The strife and jealousy were healed, and it took on elements of the apostolic church. In 3.7–8 he also invokes apostolic images. He describes the gathering

¹²⁹ See discussion above, 54–55.

¹³⁰ *Life*, 3.5.3: “καταγωνιεῖσθαι τὸν πόλεμον.”

¹³¹ This secret adversary is the evil spirit of envy which Eusebius described as infecting the church in 2.61.3 and referred to again in 2.73. As Eusebius presents the situation, it is a combination of an outside, diabolical influence and the sinful tendency of the church to turn on itself. In 2.61.3 Eusebius speaks simply of envy/jealousy, φθόνος, which creeps into the church quietly and then “dances in the middle of the assemblies of the saints (my translation).” As Barnes has noted, the *Life* is marked by a lack of consistency due to the current revision of the text at its author’s death. Thus the envy in 2.61 is attributed to an evil spirit in 2.73; Eusebius explicitly mentions “τις πονηρὸς δούλων.” He seems to be picking up on this second sense in 3.4, where he refers to “this unseen enemy” (κατὰ τὸν ἀφανοῦς ἔχθρον) as the object of Constantine’s call to battle. This in turn links it to the Spirit of envy in *Ecclesiastical History* 8.1.7 and 10.4.57.

¹³² *Life*, 3.6: “The place, too, selected for the synod, the city Nicaea (Νίκαια) in Bithynia, named for victory (victoria), was appropriate to the occasion.” The word itself means victory in battle; see Liddell-Scott, 533.

of the church fathers as an image of the gathered apostles: “εἰκόνα χορείας ἀποστολικῆς.” As in Book 10 of the *Ecclesiastical History*, in 3.8 he invokes the Book of Acts to describe the gathering of the church leaders. Eusebius goes further, in fact, describing the gathering of church fathers at Nicaea as better than the gathering of apostles in Jerusalem. Eusebius calls the throngs gathered at Pentecost in Acts 2.5 inferior (*ὕστερος*) because not all of them were ministers of God, whereas those gathered in Nicaea consisted of over 250 bishops, along with presbyters, deacons, and other attendants.

Eusebius describes Constantine as personally bringing together varying factions into unity and agreement concerning both doctrinal issues and the proper celebration of the date of Easter. Eusebius calls this a “second victory over the adversary of the church.”¹³³ After an account of the post-conciliar wrap party, in 3.17–20 Eusebius provides a letter of Constantine and in 3.21 a summary of his closing exhortation to the bishops before their departure. In his summary of Constantine’s exhortation Eusebius echoes the language he has been using through his description of the church. Constantine warns the bishops to avoid disputations between themselves. The term used here is *φιλονεικία*, recalling the dissension between the bishops in the period just before the Great Persecution. This is the only time the word appears in the *Life*, and it is employed in his summary of Constantine’s exhortation for the bishops to amend their previous conduct. The result of the emperor’s intervention is that the bishops are bound together in unity and harmony, once more a part of one body.

This description of the Council of Nicaea is consonant with Eusebius’ aims and purposes in the portrayal in Book 2 of the *Life*. In Books 2–3 Eusebius modifies the pattern of persecution and restoration of the church that he first developed in Books 8–10 of the *Ecclesiastical History*. In Book 10, the church brought the persecution on itself through a spirit of strife, envy, and jealousy. God appointed Constantine as his chosen instrument to save the church at this moment; this is at its core a scheme of salvation derived from the teachings of Origen and applied to the church as a whole while providing a particular interpretation of the role of the emperor.¹³⁴ Likewise in Books 2–3

¹³³ *Life*, 3.14.

¹³⁴ *EH*, 9.9.1 and 10.4.60, to give but two examples.

of the *Life of Constantine* the church brought controversy upon itself in combination with a vague diabolical influence. The power to save the church rested with God alone, who chose Constantine as his minister and assistant, to bring about a resolution and restore harmony to the church. This is in fact the larger purpose to Book 3 of the *Life of Constantine*, ending as it does with a description of Constantine's victories over the heretics, and ending with a picture of the church as a whole at complete peace:

Thus the members of the entire body became united, and compacted in one harmonious whole; and the one catholic church, at unity with itself, shone with full luster, while no heretical or schismatic body anywhere continued to exist. And the credit of having achieved this mighty work our Heaven-protected Emperor alone, of all who had gone before him, was able to attribute to himself.¹³⁵

Eusebius' descriptions of the Council of Nicaea and the rise of the "Arian" controversy in the *Life of Constantine* operate from a different perspective than the self-serving one that Barnes ascribes to him. Eusebius does have particular interests in mind. He does not gloss over the background to the "Arian" controversy to minimize its importance. He describes the situation of the church prior to Nicaea according to an understanding of the fall of the church through its own sinfulness, as he had done previously in the *Ecclesiastical History*. This description is dependant on traditions learned from the school of Caesarea. For Eusebius the controversies within the church are less about Arius and more an ecclesiological implementation of a world-view indebted to the teachings of Origen. His description of the pre-Nicene church is a profound ecclesiological statement. Eusebius is far from minimizing the seriousness of the controversy or glossing over its inception. The *Life of Constantine* is another example of the different ways Eusebius constructs history.

I have shown in this chapter the manner in which Eusebius approached the telling of recent history. Recent history to Eusebius serves a number of functions, of which one was to serve as a defense of his own theological tradition. Loyal to the core to Origen, Pamphilus, and the school of Caesarea, Eusebius' historical work in the *Ecclesiastical History* and the *Life of Constantine* is an application of his theological community's beliefs in order to appropriate the historical narrative

¹³⁵ *Life*, 3.66.3.

of the church. In following chapters of this dissertation, I will examine how varied groups, both Nicene and non-Nicene Christians, will attempt to do much the same. Despite their critiques, later historians are nonetheless following in his footsteps. Their motives for writing recent history are primarily an apologetic attempt to appropriate the past for their faith communities. Eusebius is more important to re-examining the “Arian” controversy than he has been given credit. Far from needing correcting, Eusebius provides the model for his continuators: be true to your school.

CHAPTER THREE

THE *CHRONICON PASCHALE* AND NON-NICENE HISTORIOGRAPHY

I. INTRODUCTION: ATHANASIUS AND THE EUSEBIAN PARADIGM

We have seen how Eusebius' *Church History* can be read as an apology. For Eusebius history, in particular recent history, is not so much the faithful representation of sources and events but rather the collecting, editing, and adaptation of source material out of demonstrative loyalty for one's local traditions and theology. This chapter will examine two authors who also played important roles in the development of church history. The first is the great episcopal influence on church historians of the fourth century, Athanasius of Alexandria. The second is an important but obscured anonymous chronicler of the mid-fourth century. This chronicler has been labeled an "Arian", and was a crucial source for the later non-Nicene church history of Philostorgius.

Modern scholarship has done much to cast Athanasius in a different light than the steadfast defender of Nicene orthodoxy.¹ This reappraisal of Athanasius is of critical importance in looking at the development of the ancient telling of the "Arian" controversy. Rather than emerging from protracted theological discussions, or set in the proper background of previous theological debate, as presented by Eusebius, as the "Arian" controversy emerged from the pen of

¹ For scholarly reappraisals of Athanasius's role in shaping the "Arian" controversy, see Michael Barnes, "The Fourth Century as Trinitarian Canon," 53–58; Hanson, *Search*, 239–273; Williams, *Arius*, 29–91; Timothy Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 19–33; Wiles, "Attitudes Towards Arius," 32–38; and Lyman, "A Topography of Heresy," 54–58. See also magisterial work of Annick Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et L'Église d'Égypte au IV^e Siècle* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1996). As her title implies, Martin's work is largely focused on the role of Athanasius in shaping the many elements (urban, monastic, ascetic, role of the bishop of Alexandria, construction of churches) which made up the Egyptian church, and contains a wealth of architectural and archaeological as well as historical material. I will largely reference Barnes' work, since he is more focused on the larger role Athanasius in shaping the controversy throughout the empire, but will cite Martin's work where appropriate.

Athanasius it became something quite different. The subtle and nuanced differences of opinion became rigid, and the prior theological conflict of the period of the Great Persecution was omitted. In describing a debate between theological traditions Athanasius invoked traditional heresiological topoi to paint Arius as the arch-heresiarch, inspired by Satan, founder of a new sect, who in denying Christ's divinity was no different from the Jews who murdered him.²

Whereas an appreciation of the complexity of the theological climate of the fourth century was not part of Athanasius' agenda, scholarship in recent years has done much to reassess the events of the early fourth century. This necessitates critically examining the most important (extant) source for these events, Athanasius himself. Reassessing Athanasius' own works and taking into account sources previously scorned as "Arian,"³ has revealed a different picture of the unfolding of events. One of the most important details that has emerged is the amount of time it took for the "Arian" controversy to develop. The supposed steadfast defender of Nicene orthodoxy waited almost ten years after the Council of Nicaea to turn his attention to the "Arians," and only when he considered himself forced to do so. After his initial condemnation in 325, Arius was later readmitted to communion at the Council of Jerusalem in 335, largely due to the efforts of Eusebius of Nicomedia. In the years following Nicaea Athanasius was concurrently engrossed in managing the Meletian schism in Alexandria and establishing his own legitimacy as bishop rather than working to expunge the "Arians" from his church.⁴ He engaged in a dispute over doctrine with rival bishops

² These categories are employed by Athanasius very early on in his crusade against the "Arians," in what is generally considered his earliest theological work dealing with Arius, the *Orations Against the Arians*, begun roughly in 339. Athanasius manages to invoke all of these topoi in a tumultuous opening chapter.

³ Such as Eusebius himself! For a recent article perpetuating the *ex post facto* heretization of Eusebius, see K.R. Constantine Gutzman, "Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea and his 'Life of Constantine': A Heretic's Legacy," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 42 (1997), 351–358. A brief extract from Gutzman serves as an excellent example of this mode of thinking: "In declaring Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea an Arianist heretic, the fathers assembled at Nicaea [Nicaea II, 787] brought the last great council of the Catholic church to a close on the same issue that had prompted St. Constantine to call the first: Trinitarianism . . . Eusebius of Caesarea was a subordinationist heretic . . . (Gutzman, 351)."

⁴ For a discussion of Athanasius' election as bishop of Alexandria and the events

only when he felt forced to discredit his opponents, shifting the debate from accusations of personal misconduct to painting himself as a defender of Nicene orthodoxy.

Thus it is only when ecclesiastical parties, some of which are followers of the martyr Lucian who are in sympathy with Arius,⁵ along with some who hold beliefs similar to Arius' but are not Lucianists,⁶ move against the bishop that the “Arian” controversy as created by Athanasius begins to take shape. Facing charges of personal misconduct, including accusations of physical violence against opponents in Alexandria,⁷ Athanasius was condemned by a synod of bishops in the city of Tyre. He appealed to the emperor, and was eventually exiled by Constantine.⁸ Faced with this deposition by a council of fellow bishops and exile by the emperor, Athanasius needed to discredit the councils of Tyre and Jerusalem and its members.⁹ In the decade of the 340s, in his theological works the *Orations Against the Arians*, begun in 339, and *Defense Against the Arians* (published in 349, begun in 341), Athanasius began to construct a polemical version of history through selected historical documents. In this construction, Athanasius changes the nature of debate from questions about his own conduct to an attack on Nicene orthodoxy by an organized, demonic, heretical horde. He links himself with Nicaea

of his early years in office, see Timothy Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 18, 20–21. See also Martin, 303–339.

⁵ The best-known and most important Lucianist supporter of Arius being Eusebius of Nicomedia. See discussion below in this chapter.

⁶ Eusebius of Caesarea, for example, who often spoke of the Logos as “second God.” His subordinationist theology, however was an expression of the Christianity he learned at the school of Caesarea and not the resulted of an organized “Arian” theology. In addition, Secundus and Theonas, the Libyan bishops who supported Arius, are also examples of supporters of Arius who were not Lucianists. See discussion of the place of Lucian in the unfolding of the “Arian” controversy in Vaggione, *Eunomius*, 44–46.

⁷ Actions corroborated by papyrus evidence; see Barnes, 32–33. Citing a papyrus of 335 which details the beating of some Meletians monks by monks sent by Athanasius to seize a Meletian bishop, Barnes notes: “Despite his protestations of innocence, Athanasius exercised power and protected his position in Alexandria by the systematic use of violence and intimidation.”

⁸ See Maurice Wiles, “Attitudes to Arius in the Arian Controversy,” in *Arianism after Arius*, 33: “His behaviour, not his theology, was the weapon his opponents sought to use against him.”

⁹ For a description of the “la coalition Mélitiano-Eusébienne” that Athanasius faced in Tyre-Jerusalem, and which succeeded in having “l'impressionable Constantin” exile him (Martin, 367), see Martin, 341–389.

and its creed over and against this party of “Arians.”¹⁰ He stresses the link between the current party and the historical Arius, something which he had not done in his previous works, to discredit his opponents. Summing up Athanasius’ presentation of Arius, Maurice Wiles writes:

he [Arius] was not so much a person to be refuted, as a discredited name with which to undermine others . . . The dead Arius was not even a whipping boy, but a whip.¹¹

This association between Arius and the “Arians” provided an opportunity for Athanasius to introduce traditional Christian anti-heretical topoi. It allowed Athanasius to create a “demonic succession,” of heresy, linking Arius and his followers to other great heresiarchs (such as Mani), the Jews, and Satan himself. Furthermore this allows Athanasius to position himself as the author of an “authentic” succession of teaching in the tradition of Alexander of Alexandria.¹² Further illustrating Athanasius’ rhetorical construction of “Arianism,” Timothy Barnes demonstrates how the term changed its meaning over time. Barnes notes that between 339–359, anyone who was against Athanasius who also was not a Meletian was labeled an “Arian.” After 359 the ecclesiastical alliances shifted. Athanasius was ready to compromise with some of his former enemies, and suddenly the term “Arian” designated the Anomeans and upholders of the homoian creed.¹³

Therefore the historical work of Athanasius reflects his theological construction of “Arianism.” In a certain sense Athanasius is very

¹⁰ See also discussion by Hanson in *Search*, 123–128.

¹¹ Wiles, “Attitudes to Arius,” 43.

¹² See Lyman, “A Topography of Heresy,” 53–54.

¹³ Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 135: “By late 359 he [Athanasius] welcomed as allies men who had long been enemies. His vocabulary shows an internal shift which reflects his change of attitude. In all of his earlier writings, including the *History of the Arians*, the word ‘Arian’ denotes anyone who condemned Athanasius who was not a Meletian—a category which originally coincided with those who also thought that Arius should not be treated as a heretic. But *On the Councils of Arminium and Seleucia* restricts the term ‘Arian’ to homoeans and anomoeans. The Athanasius who returned from exile in 362 was ready to cooperate with men who had deposed him . . .” It is important to note that while terminology concerning “Arians” developed over time, so did that concerning “Nicenes.” Just as there was a wide variety of persons opposing Nicaea, so was there a wide variety of what could be called “Nicene,” including the alleged extremism of Marcellus of Ancyra as well the moderates to whom Athanasius reached out to at Alexandria in 362. See also Martin, “362–373: Vers l’ouverture?”, in *Athanase d’Alexandrie*, 541–565.

much an inheritor of this Eusebian pattern of writing history. Eusebius' defense of the school of Origen which runs like an underwater stream in Books 6–10 of the *Church History* and his rendering of the Council of Nicaea in Books 2–3 of the *Life of Constantine* are, in a certain methodological sense, no different from Athanasius' polemic creation of the category of “Arianism” in works such as the *History of the Arians* and the *Orations Against the Arians*. Like Eusebius, Athanasius operated primarily out of loyalty to his own school of theological thought, i.e., a staunch defender of Alexander and the school of Alexandria. Hand in hand with his demonization of Arius is his emphasis on the piety and sanctity of Alexander; as Lyman writes, “Athanasius contrasted the demonic succession of Arius to the Alexandrian episcopal succession from *hagios* Alexander.”¹⁴ Along with framing the differences between Arius and Alexander in this manner, Athanasius also selectively chose documents to construct an apology for his own theology, combined with a flair for the polemical. Yet because of their subsequent reputations, Athanasius’ glossing and often blatant misrepresentation of historical fact is oft overlooked while Eusebius has been condemned for doing the same.

What is crucial in reconstructing the historical narrative of the “Arian” controversy, as opposed to the polemic constructions of Athanasius which passed into the collective memory of the church, is an understanding and appreciation of the diversity and complexity of theological opinion in the fourth century. Just as Athanasius and Eusebius crafted history to reflect the theological orientation of their faith communities, so do their successors in the struggle to tell the story of the “Arian” controversy.¹⁵ This Eusebian/Athanasian historical tradition was in turn passed on to the next generation of writers.

¹⁴ Lyman, “Mapping the Rhetorical Creation of Arianism,” 54.

¹⁵ Recently noted in Vaggione, *Eunomius*: “Thus, by the end of our period the ‘Arian controversy’ had become in some respects a battle over rival visions of the past (Vaggione, 43) . . .” Vaggione intensifies the nature of this struggle, adding, “And not just the recent past! The two sides in fact engaged in an extensive battle over the total meaning of the past which involved extensive efforts to ‘capture’ the Old Testament theophanies for their own point of view. The battle over the immediate past was a particular instance of a much wider struggle (Vaggione, 43).” Vaggione, however, confines his discussion of the struggle to the theological works of Eunomius, Aetius, and the Cappadocians. He does not intimate how church historians were also involved in this process.

II. THE ANONYMOUS “ARIAN” CHRONICLER AND THE SCHOOL OF LUCIAN

Until the synoptic historians, no one writes a history of the church on the scale of Eusebius. Historical facts contained in works produced during this period are often tangential to larger polemical purposes.¹⁶ With the passing of generations of the fourth century, a different trend emerged. Rather than the first-hand accounts of the main participants, the history of the “Arian” controversy became a self-conscious construction of the past by a variety of theological groups attempting to claim the authoritative fourth century for their own. This new trend is expressed in the composition of continuations of Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History* to incorporate the events in the church since Constantine. All too often scholarly work on the development of church history has passed from Eusebius to Rufinus and thence to Socrates and the synoptic historians, skipping these intermediate decades.

We are now aware that in the generation which separated Eusebius and his continuators, historical works were written. One of the most important of these was a church history by Gelasius of Caesarea, designed to be a continuation of Eusebius.¹⁷ Gelasius’ church history is unfortunately lost. We may conjecture that Gelasius’ work was from a Nicene perspective, given that one of his other writings, extant in fragments, is a treatise against the Anomeans. After the death of Athanasius in 373 subsequent generations of writers began to reflect on the events of the fourth century and craft extensions of Eusebius telling the story of the theological conflict through an Athanasian perspective, beginning with Rufinus’ *Ecclesiastical History*.

Significantly, there is evidence that a similar development was going on in non-Nicene theological circles. H.M. Gwatkin was the first modern scholar to expand on the theory that an anonymous Arian chronicler functioned as a source for the Byzantine *Chronicon Paschale*. In his work *Studies of Arianism* Gwatkin noted what he termed

¹⁶ In the later stages of the controversy, the exchanges between the Cappadocians and the Anomeans serve as an apt example. Eunomius, Basil, and the two Gregories incorporated historical elements into their theological treatises primarily to insult the background and upbringing of their opponents.

¹⁷ For a discussion of the relationship between Gelasius and Rufinus, see Francis Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia*, 162–164. For a review of the historiography on Gelasius and Rufinus, see Philip Amidon, *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia*, xii–xvii.

“Arian hagiology,” which he defined as positive references in sources to “Arians.”¹⁸ He argued that these stories “are not of Nicene origin” and concluded that they were the work of a Homoian source to the *Chronicon Paschale*.¹⁹ The presence of such a non-Nicene chronicle is an important piece in reassessing the historical construction of the “Arian” controversy. Arguing from the premise that church history, particularly the recounting of recent events, is more the apologetic construction of rival ecclesiastical communities than a rendering of facts, evidence of a parallel process in non-Nicene circles further bolsters this. This source, unfortunately, is not extant, even in fragments. It survives rather as part of two important Byzantine chronicles, the *Chronicon Paschale*²⁰ and the *Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor*, with smaller fragments preserved in other chronicles.²¹ In particular, scholars have noted certain aspects of the *Chronicon Paschale* from the years 337–363 which seem to bear the imprint of a chronicler favorable to the “Arian” cause. This tendency was so noticeable that in his later chronicle Theophanes the Confessor felt the need to correct information in the *CP* which seemed “Arian.” For instance, Theophanes disputed the fact that Constantine was baptized on his deathbed by the “Arian” bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia.²²

¹⁸ H.M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism* (Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1900). He first introduces what he designates “Arian hagiology” in his discussion of events in Antioch, 138–139.

¹⁹ Gwatkin, *Studies*, 222–223.

²⁰ Greek text of the *Chronicon Paschale* (hereafter shortened to *CP*) edited by Ludwig Dindorf, *Chronicon Paschale ad exemplar Vaticanum, Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, Vol. 22–23 (Bonn: 1882). Citations for the Greek text will be given with page and line number of the Dindorf edition. English translation and notes by Michael Whitby and Mary Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD, Translated Texts for Historians*, Vol. 7 (Liverpool: University Press, 1989).

²¹ See discussion in Bidez, CLII–CLV.

²² See Whitby and Whitby, xv–xvi. Theophanes deals with Constantine’s baptism in two different sections. In his discussion of the year 321/322 in *Chronographia* 19, he notes that, “In this year, as some say, Constantine the Great together with his son Crispus was baptized in Rome by Sylvester . . . The Easterners, on the other hand, claim that he was baptized on his deathbed in Nicomedia by the Arian Eusebius of Nicomedia . . . In my view it is more likely to be true that he was baptized by Sylvester in Rome . . . For if he had not been baptized, at the Council of Nicaea he could not have taken the holy sacraments nor joined in the prayers of the Holy Fathers, something that is most absurd to say and to hold.” English text translated and edited by Cyril Mango and Roger Scott, *The Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor*, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 31. See also Theophanes, *Chronographia* 33: 19–22: “Some Arians claim that he [Constantine] was deemed worthy of holy baptism at the hands of Eusebius of Nicomedia, who had been transferred to

This “Arian” source to the *CP* was discussed at length by Pierre Batiffol in an 1895 essay,²³ as well as by Whitby and Whitby in their introduction to the *CP*,²⁴ and by Joseph Bidez in his volume on Philostorgius’ *Ecclesiastical History*.²⁵ These discussions have all focused on identifying “Arian” elements of the Chronicle. Positive portrayals of Constantius, an “Arian” emperor, and praise for the sanctity of persons considered important to “Arians” are the primary arguments for establishing the “Arian” identity of the author. Batiffol begins his examination of the “Arian” source in the year 337, at the death of Constantine, and attempts to demonstrate how a sustained positive assessment of Constantius demonstrates the “Arian” author’s proclivities. For Gwatkin, the fact that the writer “makes no effort to glorify to Anomeans,” allows him to be labeled as a Homoian.²⁶ By Gwatkin’s logic, anyone not Nicene by an Athanasian definition must be an “Arian” of an anomean or homoian stripe.

I propose to set this “Arian” source in a different context. Rather than starting from the standpoint that the source is “Arian” and looking for ways in which to label the author, I will look at how the source models an apologetic paradigm of writing church history, and reveals the particular concerns of the author’s faith traditions. In doing so I will reference the church history of Philostorgius when relevant to provide parallels from another non-Nicene historian.

First and foremost it is necessary to discern from which theological tradition this “Arian” author emerged. Given a scholarly tendency to define the “Arian” category from an Athanasian perspective, the labeling of this chronicler as “Arian” has limited discussion of his theological origins. Furthermore, Battifol’s centering the discussion around Constantius,²⁷ who has traditionally been smeared with the “Arian” label by Athanasius, only further perpetuates a mono-

Constantinople. This is false, as has been pointed out; for he was baptized by Silvester in Rome, as we have already demonstrated.” Translation in Scott and Mango, 54. Socrates in 1.38 records Constantine’s baptism in Nicomedia, but does not have the information concerning Eusebius of Nicomedia.

²³ Batiffol, *Un historiographe anonyme Arien du IV^e siècle*, *Römische Quartalschrift* 9 (1895), 57–97.

²⁴ Whitby and Whitby, xvi–xviii.

²⁵ Bidez, *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte*, CLI–CLXIII.

²⁶ Gwatkin, *Studies*, 222.

²⁷ This is Batiffol’s primary focus; he calls the “Arian” source “Toujours l’éloge de Constance (Batiffol, 62).”

lithic, Nicene understanding of theological developments during this period. The full impact of an “Arian” church history, indeed of having an “Arian” being the first continuator of Eusebius, has not been present in these discussions. The complexity and diversity of theological opinion that is lost in the label of “Arian” has limited discussion in Batiffol, Gwatkin, as well as Whitby and Whitby, who have most recently and uncritically reproduced these Nicene historical categories.

The anonymous chronicler of the mid-fourth century has thus been referred to in scholarship as an “Arian” or “Homoian.”²⁸ To examine the theological perspective of this author, we must attempt to discern what school or tradition is being defended. An examination of the text reveals, like Eusebius and Athanasius, an author with close connections to a particular theological tradition. In the case of the chronicler, there is a distinct connection to the Lucianic school, the same one which produced, in some fashion, both Arius and Eusebius of Nicomedia. Certain elements of this school will also trickle down to a later historian, Philostorgius.²⁹ References to Lucian and to his disciples mark the chronicler’s description of the Great Persecution. Here we encounter the difficulty presented by the layering of sources. We must distinguish between the compiler of the *CP* on the one hand and the author of an “Arian” chronicle from which the *CP* drew as a source. In the account of the persecution, the text of the *CP* as we now have it is heavily indebted to Eusebius. We do not know if the compiler of the *CP* was following Eusebius, or whether the anonymous chronicler composed a version of events using Eusebius as a primary source, supplemented with traditions concerning the school of Lucian to which he had access, adapted wholesale by the author of the *Chronicle*. Regardless, as it now stands the *CP* follows Eusebius in its presentation of the persecution. After

²⁸ This source has been designated “Arian” due to the fact that it seems to show sympathy to certain figures so labeled by Nicene authors—e.g. Constantius, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Leontius of Antioch. Gwatkin chose to label the author “homoian” not through any theological perspective but merely because the author did not demonstrate any sympathy with the party of Aetius/Eunomius and clearly was an “Arian.” The variety of labels provided for this source have flowed from the application of Athanasian labels to persons and theological parties of the fourth century, not through any analysis of the text itself.

²⁹ See Bardy, *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d’Antioche et son école*, 33–182; see also Hanson, *Search*, 79–83; Vaggione, *Eunomius*, 45–47; and Brennecke, “Lukian von Antiochen.”

citing consular lists to date the onset of the Persecution, the opening paragraph is as close to an exact quotation from Eusebius as possible in antiquity.³⁰

Despite these initial parallels, in the further discussion of events in Nicomedia it is not so clear that the *CP* continues to follow Eusebius as closely. Concerning the fate of the initial martyrs in Nicomedia, Dorotheus and Gorgonius, in the *Ecclesiastical History* Eusebius clearly informs the reader that they were murdered by strangulation. The *CP* uses very similar phrasing to Eusebius³¹ but is silent about their manner of martyrdom. The *CP* and Eusebius both recount the beheading of Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia. At this point the *CP* breaks clearly from Eusebius and provides an important piece of information about one of the more prominent Nicomedian martyrs, Lucian of Antioch. Given that this is the first departure from material which is not present in Eusebius (apart from minor differences about manner of martyrdom) and that it marks the first of several mentions of Lucian of Antioch, I argue that it is at this point the source material particular to the author's apologetic concerns emerges.

Though quoting Eusebius at the beginning of his discussion of events in Nicomedia, the *CP* also has differences as well as similarities. This perhaps reveals access to material specifically concerning events in Nicomedia, omitting minor details which were not essential. However, despite these ambiguities, with the information on Lucian a source distinct from Eusebius emerges. From Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* we know that Lucian was a presbyter of the church of Antioch, who was arrested and sent to Nicomedia, spending perhaps as long as eight or nine years there before being martyred in 312.³² The *CP* provides information not found in Eusebius, or any-

³⁰ Compare the *CP*: “Ἐτους τῷ τῆς Διοκλητιανοῦ βασιλείας μηνὶ (αὐγούστῳ ζ') Δύστρῳ κε', λέγοιτο δ' ἂν οὗτος Μάρτιος κατὰ Ὁρωπίους . . . (*CP*, 515)” with Eusebius: “Ἐτος τοῦτο ἦν ἐννεακατάδεκατον τῆς Διοκλητιανοῦ βασιλείας, Δύστρος μήν, λέγοιτο δ' ἂν οὗτος Μάρτιος κατὰ Ὁρωπίους . . . (*EH*, 8.2.4).” The only substantial difference in the opening sentence is that the chronicler shortens the date to the letter symbols τῷ whereas Eusebius writes out the number.

³¹ *CP*: “Δωρόθεος καὶ Γοργόνιος σὺν ἑτέροις ἄμα πλείστη τῆς βασιλικῆς ὑπρεσίας οὖσιν ἐτελειώθησαν, καὶ χορὸς ἄμα πολὺν μαρτύρων ἀνεδείχθη (*CP*, 515.16–19).” Eusebius: “Δωρόθεος καὶ Γοργόνιος ἐτέροις ἄμα πλείστη τῆς βασιλικῆς οἰκετίας μετὰ τοὺς πολυτρόπους ἀγῶνας βρόχῳ τὴν εἰς ζωὴν μεταλλάξαντες . . . (*EH*, 8.6.5).”

³² Eusebius, *EH*, 8.13.2 and 9.6.3; see Bardy, *Recherches*, 3–5.

where else, for that matter. The *CP* alone preserves a quotation from a letter of Lucian:

Concerning this innumerable throng of martyrs the presbyter Lucian, writing to the Antiochenes, declared, ‘The whole choir of martyrs jointly sends you greetings. I bring you good news that Father Anthimus has met his end in the race of martyrdom.³³

Though brief, this quotation from the *CP* is the only fragment from any of Lucian’s works which survives.³⁴

This attention to the martyr Lucian reappears in the *CP* in its concluding entry for the year 327. The *CP* informs us that Constantine refounded the city of Drepanum

in honour of the holy martyr Lucian, named it Helenopolis, with the same name as his mother, and in honor of the holy martyr he granted to its present day immunity from taxation to the extent of the environs visible outside the city.³⁵

This reference is particularly important. Noting the connection of the city of Drepanum with Lucian’s tomb is not extraordinary, nor the fact that it was renamed Helenopolis. Theophanes the Confessor records the same information in his *Chronicle*. This information is also found in the *Life* of Lucian.³⁶ Yet the crucial difference between the *CP*, Theophanes, and Lucian’s *Life* is the additional emphasis on the sanctity of Lucian. For in the *CP* not only is Drepanum refounded and named after Helen, it is likewise given exemption from taxation directly as a result of Constantine’s respect for Lucian’s memory, “in honour of the holy martyr.”³⁷ This is an additional detail present in the *CP*, and not in other sources, which again has to do with Lucian of Antioch.

The *CP* also preserves another piece of evidence which emerged from its non-Nicene sources, again connected with events in Nicomedia and the martyr Lucian. This information concerns the foremost

³³ *CP* 516.2; Whitby and Whitby, 6.

³⁴ See discussion in Bardy, *Recherches*, 84. Bardy argues that the anonymous “Arian” had access to a collection of Lucian’s letters.

³⁵ Whitby and Whitby, 15.

³⁶ Theophanes 28.3–4 (Mango and Scott, 44): “In the same year he [Constantine] restored Drepanum in honour of its martyr Lucian and named it by his mother’s name Helenopolis.” The same information is found in the *Vita* of Lucian 20.5–10, collected and edited in Bidez, 201.

³⁷ *CP*, 527.12–13: “εἰς τῷν τοῦ ἀγίου μάρτυρος Λουκιανοῦ.”

disciple of Lucian, Eusebius. In the entry for the year 337, the *CP* recounts the death of Constantine. The chronicle informs us that on his way to start a campaign against the Persians Constantine died in the city of Nicomedia. As mentioned above in contrast to Nicene sources, the chronicle also tells us that he was baptized by the bishop of that city, Eusebius of Nicomedia. Eusebius of Nicomedia is an extraordinarily important person in the unfolding of the theological controversies of the fourth century, a figure about whom we know precious little firsthand.³⁸ We do know that it was Eusebius of Nicomedia who was instrumental in reconciling Arius to Constantine and the church and getting him readmitted to communion in 328.³⁹ Eusebius was an increasingly trusted theological advisor to Constantine. Barnes argues that it is Eusebius of Nicomedia, not Eusebius of Caesarea or Ossius of Cordoba, who delivered the opening address at the Council of Nicaea as recounted in the *Life of Constantine*.⁴⁰ We also know that Eusebius of Nicomedia was one of the persons to whom Arius first appealed in his dispute with Alexander of Alexandria. In his letter to Eusebius Arius refers to him a “genuine fellow disciple of Lucian.”⁴¹ Eusebius of Nicomedia was also the acknowledged leader of a theological party at the Council of Nicaea, denounced in certain sources as the “Eusebians.”⁴² Athanasius supports this depiction, referring to Eusebius as a leader of the “Arians”⁴³ and increasingly paints him as the chief villain in his deposition at the Council of Tyre. Eusebius of Caesarea acknowledges his namesake’s impor-

³⁸ See discussion in Bardy, *Recherches*, 214–216 and 296–299. See also Lienhard, *Contra Marcellum*, 77–83.

³⁹ For Barnes’ reconstruction of the events leading to Arius’ readmission to communion, see *Athanasius and Constantius*, 17–18; the discussion of the “second” Council of Nicaea is found on 246–247.

⁴⁰ *Life*, 3.11; for Barnes’ argument, see *Constantine and Eusebius*, 215, and pertinent footnotes, 380.

⁴¹ See H.G. Opitz, *Urkunden zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites*, *Athanasius Werke* 2.1. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1935), 3: “συλλογικανιστὰ ἀληθῶς Εὐσέβιε.” English translation above is Hanson’s, *Search*, 80.

⁴² Eustathius of Antioch, in a fragment preserved in Theodoret, denounced “τῶν ἀμφὶ τὸν Εὐσέβιον,” in describing the statement read before the Council. See also Hanson, *Search*, 160–161, and Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 215; see also José Declerck (ed.), *Eustathii Antiocheni, patris Nicaeni, Opera quae supersunt omnia* (Leuven: University Press, 2002).

⁴³ *Defense Against the Arians*, 59; he also mentions the Eusebians in his circular letter of 339 written in response to the appointment of Gregory of Cappadocia to the see of Alexandria. See Hanson, *Search*, 29, footnote 38 for references to the “Eusebians.”

tance, referring to him as “the great Eusebius.”⁴⁴ In his list of the disciples of Lucian, Philostorgius places Eusebius of Nicomedia in first place.⁴⁵ This comes right after Philostorgius’ discussion of the death of Lucian the Martyr. Just before he was about to die in prison, Lucian gathered his disciples around and celebrated the eucharist on his breast, distributing the elements to them.⁴⁶ Piecing together these scattered fragments of information, the significance of Eusebius of Nicomedia emerges.

Eusebius was a prominent member of the theological tradition stemming from the school of Lucian, along with Arius and other bishops and presbyters. In addition he had longtime connections with the city of Nicomedia and the imperial household through his familial connections.⁴⁷ His connections place him in the city of Nicomedia at the same time that Lucian was present. Philostorgius further informs us that he was the acknowledged leader of that circle and was probably present at the death of the teacher. Thus the “Arian” chronicler, along with evidence concerning Lucian of Antioch and his sanctity as a martyr, also contains information about the most prominent member of his theological school, the bishop Eusebius, and preserves the story of Eusebius’ baptism of Constantine. This was information so galling to later historians that the name of the baptizer was either left out, as in Socrates, or the fiction that the orthodox Silvester baptized Constantine was created and propagated, as in Theophanes.⁴⁸ These are the initial details which point to a source for the *CP* concerned with the martyr Lucian and his school of disciples.

However, evidence for this source extends from a focus on Lucian the Martyr and Eusebius of Nicomedia, his most important disciple, to another prominent member of the Lucianic school: Leontius, presbyter and later bishop of Antioch. Leontius had a significant role to play both in the early years of the “Arian” controversy and the Council of Nicaea as well as in the subsequent ecclesiastical squabbling.⁴⁹ Philostorgius tells us that Leontius was a member of the

⁴⁴ Eusebius, *Against Marcellus*, 1.4.17.

⁴⁵ Philostorgius, *EH* 2.14.1.

⁴⁶ A similar version is found in the *Life* of Lucian, para. 13; Bidez, 195.

⁴⁷ He was related to one of Licinius’ praetorian prefects and a trusted advisor to Constantine’s wife Constantia; see Hanson, *Search*, 28.

⁴⁸ See footnote 22.

⁴⁹ For Bardy’s analysis of Leontius and the school of Lucian, see *Recherches*, 193–200.

circle of disciples that included Eusebius of Nicomedia.⁵⁰ Leontius warrants particular praise from Philostorgius. Following the list of disciples in 2.14, Philostorgius informs us of the actions of each of them after the Council of Nicaea. Since for Philostorgius the Nicene Creed and its doctrine of homoousios was anathema to his Eunomian sympathies, he has harsh words for those bishops that signed the Nicene Creed: Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris of Chalcedon, and Theognis of Nicaea. Philostorgius tells us that “they were led away by the Nicene synod, but later returned.”⁵¹ Leontius, along with Antoninus of Tarsus, “preserved their piety pure and unsullied.”⁵² Philostorgius therefore draws a distinction between these followers of Lucian and the followers of Arius. Philostorgius faults Arius for affirming that God “cannot be known, comprehended, or conceived by the human mind.”⁵³ As a Eunomian, Philostorgius held that God was indeed knowable, especially in God’s essence as heterousios. Not only Arius, but most of his followers, were carried away into this error. Here Philostorgius echoes the language used to describe Eusebius of Nicomedia’s lapse at Nicaea; both Arius’ followers and those at Nicaea were led astray, “συναπαχθῆναι.” Only the bishops Secundus and Theonas, “and the disciples of the martyr Lucian, namely Leontius, Antonius, and Eusebius of Nicomedia,” held the proper beliefs; the rest adopted Arius’ faulty teaching. The emphasis on fidelity to proper belief is the central piece of Philostorgius’ description of Leontius, demonstrating his importance as the unwavering defender of Lucianic traditions concerning the nature of God. The evidence from Philostorgius demonstrates that Leontius was an important part of the succession of the school of Lucian.

Like Philostorgius, the *CP* preserves information from and about Leontius, just as it did with Lucian. Leontius first appears in the *CP* as a source for the persecution of Christians under Decius. After describing the death of Flavian, bishop of Rome, the *CP* tells us that Babylas of Antioch and many others also received the crown of

⁵⁰ Philostorgius, *EH*, 2.14.

⁵¹ Philostorgius, *EH*, 2.15: “Εὐσέβιον δὲ καὶ Μάριν καὶ Θέογνιν συναπαχθῆναι μὲν τῇ κατὰ Νίκαιαν συνόδῳ, ἀνενεχθῆναι δὲ τῆς μεταβολῆς.”

⁵² Philostorgius, 2.15: “Αντώνιον μὲν καὶ Λεόντιον ἀπαράτρωτον τὴν ἀσέβειον διασώσασθαι λέγει.” English translation by Edward Walford, *The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen and the Ecclesiastical History of Philostorgius* (London: Bohn, 1855), 441.

⁵³ Philostorgius, 2.3: “φησι διότι ἄγνωστόν τε τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἀκατάληπτον πανταχοῦ καὶ ἀνενόητον εἰσηγεῖται” Walford translation, 434.

martyrdom.⁵⁴ The *CP* then cites Leontius as a source for Babylas' martyrdom:

This has come down to us by succession concerning the holy Babylas, as the blessed Leontius, bishop of Antioch, told us.⁵⁵

Just as Lucian served as a primary source for Anthimus' martyrdom, so Leontius provides the *CP* author with evidence for Babylas' martyrdom. By including material on Lucian, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Leontius, it would seem plausible that the chronicler had access to some sort of collection of sources in the city of Antioch, where both Lucian's letter and Leontius' testimony would have been preserved.

In addition to citing Leontius as a source, the *CP* also preserves a story which attests to his holiness and piety. In an entry under the year 350, the *CP* begins with praise for Leontius, now bishop of Antioch:

The blessed Leontius, bishop of Antioch in Syria, a man who was in all respects faithful and devout and zealous for the true faith, who had also responsibility for hospices for the care of strangers, appointed men who were devout in their concern for these, among whom were three men exceedingly zealous in piety.⁵⁶

In this quotation we see a reflection of Philostorgius' descriptions of Leontius. He is described as πιστός, εὐλαβής, and ζηλωτής. In addition there is the specific distinction that he was faithful, devout, and zealous for the true faith: τῆς ἀληθοῦς πίστεως.⁵⁷ From the non-Nicene source to the *CP* it was important to note Leontius' fidelity to proper doctrine, a concern echoed by Philostorgius.

Furthermore, in praising Leontius the *CP* shows how his sanctity and fidelity to right doctrine translated itself into action, specifically the founding of hospices and the appointment of like-minded individuals. The *CP* tells us Leontius in turn chose men who were also devout and zealous.⁵⁸ A story follows recounting the pious deeds of

⁵⁴ *CP*, 503.9–12.

⁵⁵ My translation of *CP*, 503.15–18; Bidez, 203: “Κατὰ διαδοχὴν δὲ ἦλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ τὸντο περὶ τοῦ ἀγίου Βαβυλᾶ, ὃς διηγήσατο τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν ὁ μακάριος Λεόντιος, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Ἀντιοχείας.”

⁵⁶ *CP*, 535.14–19.

⁵⁷ *CP*, 535.16.

⁵⁸ *CP*, 535.17–19: κατέστησεν ἄνδρας εὐλαβεῖς ἐν τῇ τούτων φροντίδι· ἐν οἵς ἐγένοντο τρεῖς σφόδρα ζηλωταὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας.

a certain Eugenius, one of Leontius' appointees who engages a Jew in a debate over the nature of Christ. By eating a snake and not dying from the poison, Eugenius demonstrates the power of Christ; the story ends with the conversion of the Jew. Leontius is given credit for choosing and appointing these men to their positions. Indeed, the piety of these men is an extension of their bishop's; right faith is translated into miraculous deeds. Significantly for non-Nicene Christians, one of Leontius' other prominent appointments will be Aetius, whom he ordained deacon and permitted to teach in the Antiochian church.⁵⁹ As we shall see, Aetius' similar fidelity to proper doctrine will likewise give him the power to perform miracles.⁶⁰

Contrary to its “Arian” label, the *CP* preserves information concerning leaders opposed to Athanasius but not emerging from “Arian” circles. I have noted the concern with Leontius, a patron of Aetius, who was his pupil and protege. The *CP* also preserves information favorable to a subsequent bishop intimately involved with Aetius, Eunomius, and the Lucianic school, but who would later differ theologically from Aetius and Eunomius: Euzoius of Antioch. Euzoius was an early supporter of Arius. He was a deacon in Alexandria and condemned with Arius at the Council of Nicaea.⁶¹ Along with Arius he wrote a letter to Constantine requesting readmission to communion.⁶² This connection is also reflected in Photius’ editorial comment that “Euzoius, the partner of the heresy of Arius” was ordained bishop of Antioch.⁶³ Euzoius, the long-suffering associate of Arius and initial patron of the Eunomians, has an important role in the *CP*. Just as its “Arian” author preserved the circumstances surrounding the death of Constantine, the chronicler also informs us that on his deathbed Constantius received holy baptism from the hands of Euzoius, bishop of Antioch.⁶⁴ Unlike Eusebius of Nicomedia’s baptism of Constantine, this information was not suppressed by later Nicene historians since Athanasius, as part of his invective directed against Constantius, provides the information.⁶⁵ Socrates, following

⁵⁹ Philostorgius, 3.15.10, 3.17.2–4.

⁶⁰ See Chapter 5, section IV.

⁶¹ Athanasius attests to Euzoius’ connection with Arius in *De Synodis* 31. See Barnes *Athanasius and Constantius*, 17–18, and Hanson, *Search*, 8, 176.

⁶² Preserved in Socrates, 1.26.

⁶³ Philostorgius, 5.5: “τὸν συναιρεσιώτην Ἀρείου Εὐζώιον.”

⁶⁴ *CP*, 545.7–14.

⁶⁵ *De Synodis* 31.

Athanasius, also recounts this story.⁶⁶ Not surprisingly, Philostorgius preserves the incident as recounted in the *CP*, in doing so demonstrating that he had access to the same Arian source material.⁶⁷ Baptism by an “Arian” bishop fit with the Nicene goal of whitewashing the emperor with an “Arian” brush. Likewise Theophanes, as he did with the baptism of Constantine, both follows and modifies the *CP* as a source. Theophanes preserves the geographic descriptions of the *Chronicle*, noting that Constantius stopped at the first staging post from Cilician Tarsus, as well as the *CP*’s dating, noting that it was the third of Dios.⁶⁸ Yet Theophanes adds the crucial distinction that Constantius was baptized by “the Arian Euzoius.” This pejorative description of Euzoius is not present in the *CP* itself, for the reason that the non-Nicene historian had different motives. The non-Nicene source to the *CP* preserved the baptizers of both Constantine and his son, prominent members of a Lucianic circle.

Looking at the anonymous chronicler from the perspective of writing his history as a defense of his Lucianic traditions has allowed us to move beyond Gwatkin’s attempt to label the author as “homoian.” Rather than pejorative labels which emerged from Nicene Christianity, the source demonstrates concern for Lucian the Martyr and his prominent disciples. For Gwatkin, the fact that the source did not explicitly praise the “Anomeans” demonstrated that it had to come from “Homoian” circles. This failure to examine the source apart from this Nicene labeling is one of the “shadows of Arianism-as-Other” lingering in modern scholarship to which Williams refers.⁶⁹ Focusing on the Lucianic elements of the chronicler bridges the artificial difficulties created by Gwatkin’s attempts to label the source using standard Nicene heresiological categories, a labeling unchallenged in recent scholarship. Instead of the Nicene historical framework being imposed on the source, a different understanding of the theological climate and the writing of church history emerges. The anonymous chronicler is doing much the same as Eusebius and Athanasius. He is writing history from the perspective of his own faith community, defending his theological traditions and justifying

⁶⁶ Socrates, *EH*, 2.47.

⁶⁷ Philostorgius, 6.5; he reproduces the same place name as in the *CP*.

⁶⁸ Theophanes, 46; *CP* 545.9.

⁶⁹ Williams, *Arius*, 22. See also Chapter 1.

the succession of teachers through their proper beliefs and right actions.

III. REASSESSMENT OF CONSTANTIUS IN THE CHRONICON PASCHALE

The material usually ascribed to an “Arian” source is focused around the positive portrayals of the emperor Constantius. As I have noted above, I believe that this non-Nicene source material begins earlier, with concern for Lucian the martyr and his great disciple, Eusebius of Nicomedia. Central to assessing the references concerning Constantius is the larger reappraisal of the emperor in the theological disputes of the fourth century. Constantius was derided by Athanasius and consequently subsequent historians as an “Arian” emperor. As Barnes writes:

The posthumous reputation of Constantius was fixed for later generations of Christians by Athanasius, especially in his *History of the Arians*, by Hilary of Poitiers in his *Against Constantius*, and by Lucifer of Caralis: all three damned him as an ‘Arian,’ a persecutor, a devil incarnate, or even an Anti-Christ. This hostile picture does not correspond either to the complicated realities of ecclesiastical politics or to the sentiments of the majority of eastern Christians during Constantius’ lifetime.⁷⁰

As evidence to the contrary of the Athanasian picture, Barnes cites a contemporary letter of Cyril of Jerusalem praising the emperor for his love and concern for the church. In his own summary of Constantius’ reign, Barnes argues that he is a comparable figure to Constantine. Like his father, Constantius saw his role as emperor to preserve peace among his subjects, and this included working by compromise to bring about harmony in the church. Rather than pushing an “Arian” agenda, Constantius instead sought broad compromise, though, like his father, not without occasional heavy-handedness.⁷¹

⁷⁰ Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 106–107. For a discussion of Constantius’ historical reputation and his ecclesiastical policy, see also Vaggione, 201–203. See also Hans Christof Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II: Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des Arianischen Streites (337–361)* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984).

⁷¹ See relevant summary discussion in *Athanasius and Constantius*, 166–67, as well as Barnes’ discussion of Constantius’ attempts to seek compromise and uniformity in 359–360, 144–149.

Therefore, the presentation of Constantius in the *CP* is generally attributed to the “Arian” source because it is a positive one. Yet taking into account Barnes’ evidence of other positive expressions of Constantius and his role in the church, including previously favorable expressions by his later detractors Hilary and Athanasius, one cannot assume that a positive portrayal of Constantius necessarily implies an “Arian” one. Rather we must ask the same question we asked of Eusebius of Caesarea’s supposedly “Arian” interpretations of the Nicene Council. By examining the evidence apart from pre-conceived categories of “Arian” and “Nicene,” does the image of Constantius presented necessarily reflect the concerns of a non-Nicene faith community? Put in another way, must praise for the emperor necessarily come from an “Arian” perspective?

The first mention of Constantius by the “Arian” chronicler concerns the events surrounding Constantine’s funeral. The *CP* passes over the bloodbath which ensued in Constantinople, and only records that Constantius hurried back to the city to handle his father’s funeral arrangements, not to consolidate his power and eliminate potential rivals, which is what actually happened. The *CP* notes that “he escorted forth his celebrated father Constantine in such great pomp and glorious imperial procession that it is impossible to speak worthily of it.”⁷² He escorted the sarcophagus in the funeral procession to the Church of the Holy Apostles, noted for its relics of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy. The emphasis in this section is on a positive assessment of Constantius’ filial piety. Yet even Batiffol, who sees the *CP* virtually as an encomium on Constantius, notes that “there is nothing specifically Arian” in this passage.⁷³ Nonetheless he includes it as part of the “Arian” source, seeing it as part of the larger motive in comparing Constantius favorably to Constantine.

For Batiffol, the siege of Nisibis as described in *CP* also demonstrates an “Arian” portrayal of Constantius. In the *CP* account of the siege, the Persian emperor Sapor sees a vision of an angel in the form of Constantius on the walls of the city:

When he was on the verge of destroying it, and the wall had sustained a very large cleft, and the city was on the point of surrendering

⁷² Whitby and Whitby, 22; *CP* 533.8–10: “ἐν ᾧ παραγενόμενος προεκόμισε τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέροι Κονσταντίνον τὸν ἀοίδιμον ἐν τοσαύτῃ παρατάξει καὶ δόξῃ βασιλικῆς προσόδου, ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν κατ’ αξίαν.”

⁷³ Batiffol, “Un historiographe anonyme arien du IV^e siècle,” 59.

thereafter, a vision was revealed to Sapor by day, at the very hour when he was fighting: it was a man running around the walls of Nisibis, and the apparition was in the shape of Constantius the Augustus.⁷⁴

A dialogue between Sapor and the Nisibenes follows. Sapor calls on them to send their emperor out to fight. They reply that he is not in the city; Sapor accuses them of lying. It is his own magi who grasp that the angel revealed God's presence with Constantius: "they recognized the power of the angel which had appeared with Constantius, and they interpreted it to him."⁷⁵ Sapor retreats and returns to his homeland, with most of his army perishing from disease. Victory is here attributed to an angel of God appearing in the form of the emperor Constantius. Yet there is nothing particularly "Arian" about this event, other than it is a positive assessment of the emperor. Theophanes, who made the effort to correct the *CP* in regards to the baptism of Constantine, recounts the siege of Nisibis in a similar manner: the city is delivered by the vision of an angel, in this case leading Constantius by the hand rather than in the form of Constantius.⁷⁶ For Batiffol, this description of the siege of Nisibis is an attempt to equate the glory of Constantius with that of Constantine by showing that the victories of both are due to divine favor.⁷⁷ We are left, however, with the same question: if we are to discount or at least doubt the characterization of Constantius as an "Arian," how does a positive assessment of the emperor somehow reveal "Arian" sympathies?

Later descriptions of the deliverance of Nisibis do indeed minimize the emperor's role. This is only after his reputation as an "Arian" had been assured to posterity through the writings of Athanasius. Deliverance of the city is instead later ascribed to James, bishop of Nisibis.⁷⁸ However, Theophanes, who felt the need in other

⁷⁴ Whitby and Whitby, 28.

⁷⁵ Whitby and Whitby, 28.

⁷⁶ Theophanes, *Chronographia* 39:13–40 (Mango and Scott, 65–66). Mango and Scott's argument that Theophanes "minimizes deliberately" the details which would seem to favor Constantius is unconvincing. Theophanes states the facts in a similar fashion as in the *CP*. The only difference in his account is that the angel leads Constantius by the hand and is not in the form of the emperor. Deliverance of the city is still attributed to divine favor on Constantius.

⁷⁷ Batiffol, 60.

⁷⁸ For the development of the legend of James, see Paul Peeters, "La Légende de Saint Jacques de Nisibe," *Analecta Bollandia* 38 (1920), 285–373. See also discussion in Vaggione, 179–180.

places to correct what he saw as “Arian” sources, reproduces the *CP* version. It is Theodoret who is instrumental in altering the understanding of the events of the siege. Rather than the miraculous intervention of an angel, it is the prayer and exhortation of the bishop which stirs the people up to repair the walls: “For that holy man, through prayer, (θεῖος ἐκεῖνος ἀνήρ, διὸ προσευχῆς) filled with valour both the troops and the rest of the townfolk, and both built the walls, withstood the engines, and beat off the advancing foe.”⁷⁹ Sapor, amazed at the repair of the walls, does see a vision which he mistakes for Constantius. His magi inform him that Constantius is in Antioch, whereupon Sapor concludes, “their God is fighting for the Romans.” The vision is never explicitly described as resembling Constantius in Theodoret’s account; Sapor only thinks it does. Further minimizing the role of the apparition, the reason given for Sapor’s retreat is ascribed not to the vision, but to James ascending to the battlements and flinging a curse of mosquitoes on the Persian army. Deliverance is not from Constantius, but rather from the holy protector bishop.⁸⁰ The later account by Theodoret is a clear attempt to appropriate the glory of deliverance from the emperor, whom he regards as manifestly an Arian,⁸¹ to a James, a Nicene bishop and Syriac holy man.

This same observation can be extended to other favorable assessments of Constantius. These assessments need not necessarily come from an “Arian” source. The *CP* further informs us that “God was with Constantius, guiding his empire. For he himself took great care for the churches of Christ.”⁸² This is the most positive assessment of Constantius’ piety. Yet, as Barnes has shown, it does not imply “Arian” sympathies, as he has demonstrated with the case of Cyril of Jerusalem’s letter. The same is the case with the vision of the Cross in the sky over Jerusalem as recounted in the *CP*. While marching against the usurper Magnentius, Constantius sees a vision of the Cross in the sky; subsequent to seeing this vision he defeats Magnentius

⁷⁹ Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History*, 2.30. Translation by Bloomfield Jackson, NPNF, Series II, Volume II (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 91.

⁸⁰ For a discussion of the development of the myth of protector bishops, see James C. Skedros, *Saint Demetrios of Thessaloniki: Civic Patron and Divine Protector, 4th–7th centuries CE*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999.

⁸¹ Theodoret, *EH*, 2.3 and 2.32, to cite but two examples.

⁸² Whitby and Whitby, 30; *CP*, 539.17–19.

in battle. Much as with the siege of Nisibis, there is nothing in this description which necessarily emerges from an “Arian” perspective. In fact, in corroborating the vision of the Cross we have evidence of a letter from Cyril of Jerusalem, where he describes Constantius as “most pious.” It is only after the fact that this causes some embarrassment. As with the siege of Nisibis, it is later authors who feel the need to amend what may seem to be divine favor on an heretical emperor. Theophanes feels the need to defend Cyril, noting that some charged him with “Arianism” for his positive assessment of Constantius’ piety. Theophanes defends Cyril’s use of the words “most pious” through a tendentious circumlocution, arguing that Constantius was indeed pious at heart, yet had been led astray and beguiled by “Arian” bishops.

Thus the events which have been used to characterize the *CP* as “Arian” are rather evidence of the fact that there was a diversity of opinions of the emperor’s piety and a diversity of motivations for authors to portray Constantius. To be sure, the *CP* does favorably compare Constantius to Constantine. In discussing the dedication of the Great Church, the *CP* notes that as part of his benefaction to the poor of the city Constantius “added a corn allocation of greater size than that which his father Constantine has bestowed.”⁸³ The reductionist argument that positive comments about Constantius reveal Arian sympathies is simply not a given when the diversity and complexity of theological debates are taken into account.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have demonstrated how the Eusebius’ apologetic model of church history was passed on to the historians of the fourth century. Athanasius’ extensive correspondence reflects this by demonstrating his loyalty to his Alexandrian traditions. The anonymous chronicler likewise evidences this Eusebian paradigm. Labeled either ambiguously as an “Arian” or identified as “Homoian,” this author is writing in a similar fashion as Eusebius and Athanasius. By recon-

⁸³ Whitby and Whitby, 35. Again uncritically applying Nicene historical categories, Whitby and Whitby, following Batiffol, in footnote 112 conclude “the favourable attitude of *CP*’s source towards the Arian emperor is again revealed in this catalogue of his benefactions.”

structing the facts which this chronicler provides, we can see that he writes from the perspective of the traditions of Lucian of Antioch. He preserves information about the martyr Lucian, including the only fragment from any of his writings and an emphasis on his sanctity. He also informs us that Eusebius of Nicomedia, the great disciple of Lucian, baptized Constantine the emperor. In addition he also devotes particular attention to Leontius, bishop of Antioch and later patron of Aetius, and Euzoios, another prominent early supporter of Arius and patron of Eunomius.

I have also shown the limitations of looking at this source of the *Chronicon Paschale* as an “Arian.” Along with positive assessments of various persons involved generally labeled as “Arians,” the chronicler also provides a sustained positive reflection on the emperor Constantius. He favorably compares him to his father Constantine in a variety of settings, from filial piety to the victorious warrior favored by God to the pious custodian of the churches of God. Yet there is nothing in any of these depictions of Constantius which necessarily dictate that they derive from an “Arian” source. Acknowledging that a diversity of opinion existed regarding the emperor, along with a lack of direct reference to Constantius’ beliefs, we are left to conclude that this positive assessment of the emperor does not necessarily imply that it comes from an “Arian” source. The predominant focus of the non-Nicene source to the *Chronicon Paschale* is a demonstrative loyalty to the school of Lucian of Antioch. In the next chapter we will look at the most important author in the evolution of Nicene historiography, Rufinus of Aquileia and his continuation of Eusebius.

CHAPTER FOUR

RUFINUS OF AQUILEIA AND THE BEGINNINGS OF NICENE HISTORIOGRAPHY

I. INTRODUCTION

So far we have examined the contributions of Eusebius of Caesarea, Athanasius of Alexandria, and the anonymous Lucianic chronicler in their efforts to recount the events of the theological debates of the early fourth century. In this chapter we will examine the most important person in determining the normative Nicene version of the events of the fourth century, Rufinus of Aquileia.¹ Rufinus holds a significant if often underappreciated place in the history of Christianity. He is best known his efforts in translating and preserving many of Origen's writings. Yet his work in translating and continuing Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* is likewise important. Rufinus' interpretation and organization of Athanasian source material, supplemented with independent traditions and wholesale Rufinian constructions, would be enormously influential for later Nicene synoptic historians. Despite their objections, Socrates and later Theodoret were both indebted to Rufinus, and it is through these authors that a Nicene version of the fourth century passed into the subsequent historical memory.² However, before turning to Rufinus we need to

¹ For an exposition of Rufinus' motives and methods in writing his *Ecclesiastical History*, see Françoise Thélamon, *Paiens et Chrétiens au IV^e siècle: l'apport de l'*Histoire ecclésiastique* de Rufin d'Aquilée* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1981). See also her article “Écrire l'histoire de l'Église: d'Eusèbe de Césarée à Rufin d'Aquiliée,” in Bernard Pouderon (ed.), *L'historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles* (Paris: Beauchesne, 2001), 207–235.

² In this work I will be focusing on the role of Rufinus in transmitting what I have called the Athanasian paradigm to the synoptic historians Theodoret, Sozomen, and Socrates. I have not included a discussion of the role of Hilary of Poitiers. Hilary, while significant for communicating the Christological issues to the West, was less important as an actual source for the synoptics. There has been more emphasis on his theological works in which he articulates the Nicene theology of Athanasius than his role in establishing a historical narrative. He was, however, important in solidifying popular conceptions of Constantius as an “Arian” emperor. Hilary was often painted with the same hagiographic brush as Athanasius. For the

briefly examine the place of Epiphanius of Salamis in the development of Nicene historiography.³

Epiphanius, a controversial figure in his own time,⁴ likewise exerts a controversial influence in the development of church history. Epiphanius is an important preserver of documents which would have otherwise been lost, and supplements his historical documents with oral sources,⁵ yet his value in reconstructing events and assessing the history of the fourth century is complicated by his theological convictions and methodological hermeneutic. Though a valuable historical source, Epiphanius is fundamentally not an historian, and his purpose is not to write history; it is only an ancillary element to his larger purposes of heresiology. As Frank Williams, the editor and translator of the *Panarion*, notes: “The *Panarion* is heresiology.”⁶ Raymond Van Dam also emphasizes that we should be wary of Epiphanius’ historical hermeneutic, noting that his main goal was

classic exposition of Hilary as the “Athanasius of the West,” see C.F.A. Borchardt’s *Hilary of Poitiers’ Role in the Arian Struggle* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966). For more recent studies which take into account the recent critical examination of the Nicene period, see D.H. Williams, “Reassessment of the Early Career and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers,” in E. Ferguson, ed., *History, Hope, Human Language and Christian Reality: Studies in Early Christianity, Vol. 6* (New York: Garland, 1999), 338–353; see also H.C. Brennecke, *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II: Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des Arianischen Streites (337–361)* (New York: De Gruyter, 1984), particular 356–359 and 368–371 on Hilary’s interaction with Constantius. See also Pieter Frans Smulders, *Hilary of Poitiers’ Preface to his Opus Historicum* (New York: Brill, 1995), especially 151, 154. See also the relevant section in Hanson, *Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 459–471.

³ For a discussion of Epiphanius, his work, and his place in the fourth century, see Aline Pourkier, *L’Hérésiologie chez Épiphane de Salamine* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1992); and Jon Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity*. For recent articles on Epiphanius, see Rebecca Lyman, “Ascetics and Bishops: Epiphanius on Orthodoxy,” in *Orthodoxy, Christianity, History*, Susanna Elm, Éric Rebillard, and Antonella Romano, eds., (Rome: École Française, 2000), 149–161; Susanna Elm, “The dog that did not bark: doctrine and patriarchal authority in the conflict between Theophilus of Alexandria and John Chrysostom of Constantinople,” *Christian Origins*, 68–93; Rebecca Lyman, “Origen as Ascetic Theologian,” and Lyman, “The Making of a Heretic: The Life of Origen in Epiphanius *Panarion* 64,” *Studia Patristica* 31, 445–451.

⁴ Among the issues Epiphanius was drawn into are both the schism in Antioch and the conflict between John Chrysostom and Theophilus of Antioch concerning the “Tall Brothers.” See Socrates, 6.10, and Sozomen, 8.14, for Epiphanius’ journey to Constantinople on behalf of Theophilus; see also Elm, “The dog that did not bark.”

⁵ As in *Panarion* 68.3.1.

⁶ Frank Williams, ed. and translator, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), xvi.

not to summarize or recount but “to refute these heresies, either by counterarguments or by outright mockery.”⁷ Epiphanius is not writing a history on the scope of Eusebius or even the anonymous chronicler. Rather he is composing a work which attempts to systematize, categorize, and refute every heresy since Adam, from barbarism to Judaism to Gnosticism to the “Semi-Arians” of his own day. This is not a literary form or theological perspective peculiar to Epiphanius; he stands in a long tradition of Christian heresiology, building on the foundations laid by Justin, Irenaeus, and Hippolytus, among others.⁸ As primarily a heresiologist Epiphanius uses historical information or chronology in order to show theological continuity or superiority of “orthodoxy.” His work therefore follows a pattern of providing exposition and then refutation ($\alphaντροπή$), particularly from the Scriptures, for the heresies which he presents.⁹ While he does sometimes provide pieces of historical information, formulating a cohesive historical narrative is not his main concern and not an essential aspect of his motives for writing. Instead, his historical material functions as part of the initial exposition component of his various chapters.

Given his commitment to Nicene orthodoxy and historical method, however compromised by his theological motives, Epiphanius is an important witness in assessing the eventual predominance of a Nicene understanding of what would become the “Arian” controversy. This is due to the fact that he was a zealous supporter of the traditions and legacy of Nicene Christianity as interpreted by Athanasius. It is an understatement to assert that Epiphanius was rabidly pro-Nicene. In the *Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* R.P.C. Hanson describes Epiphanius as “narrow-minded at best and silly at worst,” damning him with faint praise as “another second-rate theologian standing in the tradition of Athanasius.”¹⁰ Williams comments that “It is Epiphanius’ inflated self-esteem which renders him the least attractive.”¹¹ Rebecca Lyman notes that the bishop “is well known in

⁷ Raymond Van Dam, *Becoming Christian: the Conversion of Roman Cappadocia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 44.

⁸ See Pourquier, *L'Héresiologie chez Épiphane de Salamine*, 54–75. For Justin’s work in establishing the concept of $\alphaιρησις$, see Alain Le Boulluec, *La notion d'hérésie*, 87–88.

⁹ For a description of Epiphanius’ method, see Pourquier, 24–27, and 78–82.

¹⁰ Hanson, *Search*, 658.

¹¹ Williams, *Panarion*, xxv.

ancient and modern sources, as bishop of narrow, but energetic, theological views.”¹² Despite the value of his *Panarion* in preserving various documents and theological texts, Epiphanius nonetheless stands on the margins in the development of historiography, both Nicene and non-Nicene, which is the main focus of this dissertation.¹³ Epiphanius’ preservation of factual events is only collateral damage from his larger refutations. A brief example of Epiphanius’ treatment of the “Arians” demonstrates his method.

Epiphanius begins his discussion of the Arians in *Panarion* 68. This section is supposedly concerned with the Melitians, but in fact is largely devoted to Arius. Epiphanius’ source is primarily Athanasius, supplemented with various other oral and written traditions. He is more sympathetic to the Melitians than Athanasius, noting Melitus’ “faith never changed from that of the holy catholic church”¹⁴ and that “he instigated a schism, but certainly not an alteration of the faith.”¹⁵ Melitus’ main function in Epiphanius’ account is to expose the heresy being fostered by Arius. According to Epiphanius, it is Melitus who first reports Arius to Alexander of Alexandria. In a subsequent local synod Arius is deposed. The behavior of the later followers of Melitus is not as exemplary as their founder. The later Melitians formed an active alliance with Eusebius of Nicomedia to have Arius received back into communion. Epiphanius explicitly draws a distinction between Melitus and his followers:

Theirs has been the proverbial fate of fleeing the smoke to fall into the fire. For the Melitians, who were once pure and absolutely correct in their faith, have gotten mixed up with the disciples of Arius.¹⁶

¹² Lyman, “Ascetics and Bishops,” 151.

¹³ While tangential to the development of the historiographic development of the fourth century, Epiphanius is at the center of some of the other ingredients in the Nicene alchemist’s formula. Lyman, in “The Making of a Heretic,” and “Ascetics and Bishops,” has shown how Epiphanius’ work reflects shifts in understandings of episcopacy, asceticism, and heresy in the post-Nicene church. Elm, “The dog that did not bark,” looks at the role Epiphanius played in the larger development of patriarchal authority; Clark, *The Origenist Controversy*, places Epiphanius within the spectrum of debates over the developing ascetic practices and the theology of Origen.

¹⁴ *Panarion*, 68.1.1.

¹⁵ *Panarion*, 68.1.4.

¹⁶ *Panarion*, 68.6.5: “γέγονε γὰρ αὐτοῖς τοῦτο κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν ὅτι φεύγοντες τὸν καπνὸν εἰς πῦρ ἐνέπεσον. Συνεμίγησαν γὰρ οἱ καθρεύοντές ποτε καὶ ἀκροδίκαιοι τῇ πίστει Μελιτιανοὶ μετὰ τῶν τοῦ Ἀρείου μαθητῶν.”

Thus the Melitians serve primarily to reinforce and supplement the Athanasian accusations that the “Arian” controversy was primarily the work of a concerted group of disciples of Arius.

The material on the Melitians is in reality a prelude to one of the *Panarion*’s longest sections, dealing with the “Arianomaniacs.” Epiphanius is following Athanasius, primarily drawing from the *Second Apology/Defense Against the Arians*, *Orations Against the Arians*, and *Letter to Serapion*.¹⁷ Following Pourquier’s analysis of Epiphanius’ model of exposé and réfutation, *Panarion* 68 functions as part of a larger exposition which continues in *Panarion* 69.1–12. The remainder of *Panarion* 69 consists a lengthy refutation of Arian positions from Scriptural proof-texts. In *Panarion* 68–69 we clearly see Epiphanius’ method: historical exposition of heresy followed by refutation from Scripture. Historical details come largely from Athanasius, and are part of a larger pattern of Epiphanius’ polemical heresiological taxonomy.

Therefore Epiphanius exerted a rhetorical rather than a historiographic influence on later historians. Socrates’ main sources were Eusebius, Athanasius, and Rufinus, along with certain other collections now lost, and not Epiphanius.¹⁸ Epiphanius’ true significance is a direct outgrowth of his work as a heresiologist. By attempting to categorize and create a comprehensive taxonomy of heresy, he created a more refined heresiological discourse than Athanasius’ fiery attacks on the “Arianomaniacs,” and which shaped subsequent historical works on the period. He provides us with terms such as “Semi-Arians,” “Pneumatomachoi,” and “Anomoeans,” which were taken over by later historians to define various non-Nicene movements and parties in the later fourth century. Though not directly influenced by Epiphanius, later historians write their history using his categories.¹⁹

¹⁷ Williams, *Panarion*, footnote 1, 315; footnote 1, 325.

¹⁸ For a discussion of Socrates’ sources, see Urbainczyk, *Socrates of Constantinople*, 48–64.

¹⁹ Two important early works dealing with the “Arian” controversy, John Henry Newman’s *Arians of the Fourth Century* and Gwatkin’s *Studies of Arianism* both perpetuate the Epiphanian categories of “Anomoeans” “Homoeans” and “Semi-Arians.” See Williams, *Arius*, 2–15; Ferguson, “The Enthralling Heretical Power.”

II. RUFINUS AND THE CONTINUATION OF EUSEBIUS

For a much greater and unquestioned significance for Nicene understandings of the fourth century we turn to Rufinus of Aquileia. Rufinus has occupied a curious position in the history of Christianity. His work as a translator was crucial in preserving Origen's works, but he has nonetheless weathered criticism from both his contemporaries and subsequent generations of later historians for his attempts to blunt criticism of Origen through his translations. Compared to his translations of Origen and place in the "Origenist" controversy,²⁰ Rufinus' historical work is often overshadowed. Despite its lack of standing in contemporary scholarly circles, Rufinus' translation and additions to Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* was an important work for its time and had substantial influence. Augustine cited it, and it was one of the few works of the time which was translated from Latin into Greek.²¹

One perspective from which Rufinus' work has been analyzed concerns his translations of Books 1–9 of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*. Given Rufinus' attempt to edit some of the more controversial aspects of Origen's theology in his translations, in an early and important article J.E.L. Oulton demonstrated similar concerns at work in his translation of Eusebius.²² For Oulton,

Rufinus was not a satisfactory or a faithful translator. We need not dwell upon his treatment of Origen's theological improprieties, which involved him in so much controversy in his own day; it will be shewn [sic] later on in this essay that he deals similarly with doubtful expressions in Eusebius.²³

Oulton identifies several different editorial motives in Rufinus. Each of them reflects the reading back of current understandings of orthodoxy into an earlier period. One has to do with correcting Eusebius' *ex post facto* "Arianism." Particularly in the opening books of the *Ecclesiastical History*, where Eusebius discusses the nature of the Logos,

²⁰ See Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, 159–193.

²¹ For a discussion of Augustine's use of Rufinus and the translation of his work from Latin to Greek, see Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia*, 175; see also Thélamon, *Paiens et Chrétiens*, 14.

²² J.E.L. Oulton, "Rufinus's Translation of the Church History of Eusebius," *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1929), 150–174.

²³ Oulton, 150.

Rufinus substantially edits Eusebius' subordinationism. To give but one of the many examples Oulton provides, in 1.2.9 Eusebius' phrase “δεύτερον μετὰ τὸν πατέρα κύριον,” was translated into Latin as “*dominus ipse cum domino*.” Furthermore, Oulton argues, it is this editorial perspective which is the part of the reason for Rufinus' omission of the Panegyrical Oration in 10.4–72. Given the preponderance of subordinationist language concerning the Logos, Rufinus simply chose to leave out the entire speech. Second, Rufinus corrects several of Eusebius' statements on the canon of the New Testament. Given that the nature of the canon had become more standardized by the beginning of the fifth century, some of Eusebius' comments regarding the authenticity of certain books were modified by Rufinus. For example, Eusebius' statement that the Epistle of James “is considered spurious”²⁴ is translated by Rufinus as “it is not received by some.”²⁵

In addition, Rufinus both edits and adds to Eusebius' description of the life of Origen in Book 6. Demonstrating access to additional sources and subsequent traditions, he provides material not found in Eusebius. For example, he includes a more detailed description of Origen's mother hiding his clothes. Rufinus likewise quotes Origen's actual words to Demetrius in defense of his castration. He provides additional emphasis on Origen's piety, emphasizing his asceticism.²⁶ Rufinus also provides an additional defense of later actions of Origen, in particular his ordination in Caesarea.²⁷ In his conclusion, Oulton notes that Rufinus' translation of Eusebius was “tinged by the circumstances of his career.”²⁸ He added details where his monastic journeys or favorable attitude towards Origen made additional information available to him. Thus according to Oulton the motives for Rufinus' particular historical perspective are due to pit-stops on his monastic journeys rather than from any discernable theological tradition. Clark has recently refuted such notions, noting that Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History* should be set within his defense of Origen, in response to the attacks of Jerome.²⁹

²⁴ *EH*, 2.23.25: “ἰστέον δὲ ως νοθεύεται μέν.”

²⁵ Oulton, 156: “*a nonnullis non recipiatur.*”

²⁶ For example, Rufinus notes that in addition to converting the pagans who came to hear him teach in Alexandria, Origen “also instructed in the principles of a perfect life.”

²⁷ Oulton, 162.

²⁸ Oulton, 174.

²⁹ See Clark, 181–183.

Some recent scholars, however, continue to have a less than favorable assessment of Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History*. In a standard patrological survey, Frances Young's *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*, Rufinus is passed over in a discussion of Eusebius' various successors and continuators.³⁰ Young's reason for omitting Rufinus is her conviction that Rufinus was only a translator, not an original author, and thus considers his additions to Eusebius as largely a reworking of Gelasius of Caesarea's *Ecclesiastical History*. This debate concerning the interrelation between Gelasius and Rufinus reflected in Young's work is a longstanding one. Some scholars, tending to take Rufinus as little more than a translator, have argued that Books 10 and 11 of his *Ecclesiastical History* were similar free translations from Gelasius as were his Origenist works. Anton Glas proposed the theory that Rufinus did not write Books 10 and 11, citing as one of his reasons that Rufinus had never produced an original work.³¹ The question as to whether Rufinus or Gelasius came first continued for decades. The determining factor became focused on which years Gelasius' *Ecclesiastical History* covered as opposed to Rufinus' work. Jacques Schamp effectively brought the debate to a close by showing that Photius' *Bibliotheca* reveals that Gelasius' *Ecclesiastical History* ended with the death of Arius, and that Gelasius, as opposed to Rufinus, dated Arius' death to the reign of Constantine.³² Thus if there was any overlap at all, it would have been for a very small portion, given that the overwhelming majority of Rufinus' work deals with events which follow the death of Arius.

Those who accepted the independence of Rufinus and the originality of his additions to Eusebius have been willing to acknowledge the significance of his work. In a 1946 article Maurice Villain noted that Rufinus was "the first to reclaim this Nicene and post-Nicene period."³³ Such an attempt, for Villain, was bound to be judged by

³⁰ France Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: a Guide to the Literature and Background* (London: SCM Press, 1983), 23.

³¹ Anton Glas, *Die Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1914), 74. At the same time as Glas' work, Paul van den Ven instead argued for a Greek translation of Rufinus which had been attributed to Gelasius which later sources used; see Amidon, *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia*, xiii.

³² Jacques Schamp, "The Lost Ecclesiastical History of Gelasius of Caesarea: Towards a Reconsideration," *Patristic and Byzantine Review* 57 (1987), 151–152.

³³ Maurice Villain, "Rufin d'Aquilée et l'Histoire Ecclésiastique," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 33 (1946), 186.

later authors. He notes that Rufinus is faulted for his errors in chronology and his predilection towards incorporating the miraculous. Françoise Thélamon's work continues a positive assessment of Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History* but provides a different framework in which she argues the work needs to be interpreted. Agreeing with Villain, Thélamon notes that

Rufinus wrote, in Latin, the first history of the fourth-century church. His choices, the manner in which he presents the facts that he decides to introduce, and the plan of his work had a great influence . . .³⁴

Yet Thélamon fundamentally disagrees with the conception that Rufinus' predilection for the miraculous somehow undermines his historical credibility. Rather, she argues that Rufinus had particular apologetic motives for writing, and gives a particular and detailed interpretation of these motives. For Thélamon, Rufinus attempted to "show the presence of God in the past" while helping people in an anxious time of unrest to forget the present.³⁵ His emphasis on the miraculous, which had earned him the scorn of a previous generation of scholars, for Thélamon serves as signs of God's providential involvement in the church.³⁶ The history of the church is a "holy history" and needs to be treated as such.³⁷ She devotes particular attention to Rufinus' description of the expansion of Christianity to Ethiopia, Georgia, and the Saracens, which, combined with an equally extensive section devoted to Rufinus' anti-pagan polemic, serve as examples of the miraculous expansion of Christianity as expressed in the power of God working through the church. Furthermore she examines the role of the miraculous as it pertains to matters of doctrine. For Thélamon, a similar pattern is in place: the power of God is revealed through the miraculous and wonderworking actions of various persons. She notes Rufinus' emphasis on the miraculous at the Council of Nicaea,³⁸ the attention devoted to Gregory and

³⁴ Thélamon, *Pâtiens et Chrétiens*, 13: "Rufin écrivait ainsi, en latin, la première histoire de l'Église du IV^e siècle. Ses choix, la façon dont il présente les informations qu'il décide de faire connaître, le plan de son ouvrage ont eu une grande influence . . ." Thélamon makes essentially the same argument in her article "Ecrire l'histoire de l'Église:" "l'économie du salut se déploie au cours d l'histoire de l'Église jusqu'au temps présent (Thélamon, 209)."

³⁵ Thélamon, *Pâtiens et Chrétiens*, 23.

³⁶ Thélamon, 24.

³⁷ Thélamon, 26.

³⁸ Thélamon, 336.

Basil,³⁹ and God's judgment revealed in the shameful deaths of Arius and Valens.⁴⁰

While I am in agreement with Thélamon's analysis of the role of the miraculous in Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History*, her central hermeneutical principle does not take into account the reinterpretation of historical events which is also a part of Rufinus' method and purpose. For Thélamon, to look at Rufinus' work as primarily an expression of the power of God working through the church necessitates a limit to historical inquiry. Since she assumes that neither the authenticity of particular sources nor the truthfulness of certain events are part of his agenda, Thélamon does not explore the implications of Rufinus' decisions to date certain events or the manner in which he chose to describe certain historical events, such as the death of Constantine. Rather, Thélamon states that "The hagiographic function as an element of the account thus fixes the limit of historiographic inquiry."⁴¹

Thélamon's work describes an important apologetic element of Rufinus' work, showing how Rufinus is very much standing in the tradition of Eusebius. Like Eusebius, a fundamental element of his theology of history is that the providential hand of God is at work in the establishment and expansion of the church in the fifth century as much as it was in the first, second, third, and fourth. Yet to limit the parallels between Eusebius and Rufinus to this theme, and to discount the historical oddities and particularities of Rufinus' text as somehow beyond the limits of historical investigation, neglects the exploration of how the choices Rufinus made in writing history are likewise a product of certain apologetic and polemic motivations. Oulton has demonstrated ably in his article how Rufinus paid close attention to detail in his translation of the first nine books of Eusebius' church history. In doing so he showed that he was very much a continuator of Eusebius in the paradigm of history described in Chapter 2. Like Eusebius, one of Rufinus' purposes is to construct an extended apologetic for his theological tradition, standing in the school of Origenist thought as mediated through his contact and study with Didymus the Blind. Given the care and manner in which Rufinus chose to present historical fact in the opening books, why

³⁹ Thélamon, 442.

⁴⁰ Thélamon, 444–448.

⁴¹ Thélamon, 28: "La fonction hagiographique d'un élément du récit fixe donc la limite de l'enquête historiographique."

should we assume that this should be discounted in the two books added to Eusebius, and instead be interpreted only through a particular hermeneutic framework?

In the following sections I will argue that Rufinus in fact provides the foundational narrative to the historical events born out of Athanasian polemic: he combines a Eusebian method of writing history with a fundamentally Athanasian reading of the fourth century. The historical details in Books 10 and 11 of Rufinus' work reveal additional polemic concerns to those outlined by Thélamon. Rufinus, like Eusebius, constructs an apologetic version of history, revealing the concerns of a particular faith community and theological tradition. In Books 1–9, Rufinus demonstrates his loyalty to the traditions of Origen. In Books 10–11, he reveals his equally deep commitment to the Athanasian understanding of Nicene orthodoxy and historical interpretation of the fourth century.

This fusion of Eusebian and Athanasian historical paradigms in writing recent Christian history can be found in the opening sentences of 10.1 of Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History*. Rufinus begins his description of the church prior to the “Arian” controversy as one free from persecution, at peace with itself, shortly to be menaced by internal dissent:

Alexander received the episcopal office after Achillas, who had succeeded the martyr Peter in Alexandria, and it was then that since our people were enjoying peace and a respite from persecution, and the glory of the churches was crowned by the merits of the confessors, the favorable state of our affairs was disturbed by strife within.⁴²

In his opening sentence Rufinus continues the Eusebian themes concerning persecution of the church: during times of peace and prosperity, the church is particularly vulnerable to dissent (*contentio*) from within. This Eusebian setting is then combined with a presentation of the “Arian” controversy drawn from Athanasius. It is Arius who disturbs the peace of the churches, motivated by pride,⁴³ putting forth teachings concerning the nature of God “which had never before been talked about.”⁴⁴ Rufinus’ assertion that no one had

⁴² Rufinus, *EH*, 10.1; PL 21: 469: “prosperitas rerum nostrarum domestica contentione turbatur.”

⁴³ Rufinus, *EH*, 10.1: “sed gloriae laudisque et novitatis improbe cupidus . . .”

⁴⁴ Rufinus, *EH*, 10.1: “et quae antea in quaestionem nunquam venerant . . .”

spoken about God the Father and the Son like Arius did is a particularly revealing statement, given that he worked assiduously in his editorial revisions to Books 1–9 of the *Ecclesiastical History* to erase the presence of similar language. Rufinus is in effect shaping his interpretation of a Nicene present through the editing of a theologically diverse past. The subtlety of the Eusebian version of the rise of the “Arian” controversy is lost in the application of Athanasius’ heresiological discourse in laying the blame at the feet of the prideful, innovating heretic. Using the language of infection and disease, Rufinus reports that the doctrines of Arius spread throughout the empire until they at last came to the attention of the emperor. It is here that Rufinus moves beyond traditional heresiological discourse and begins an active construction of the relationship between Nicene orthodoxy and the imperium.

III. ROLE OF THE IMPERIUM IN THE “ARIAN” CONTROVERSY

The first theme we need to examine is Rufinus’ portrayal of the emperors Constantine and Constantius and the relationship between these two emperors and the theological parties of the fourth century. As noted in the previous chapter, the fourth century demonstrates a wide swath of opinion concerning the role of imperial authority in the life of the church. When it was on one’s side, it was praised as the action of a pious and God-fearing emperor; when on someone else’s side, the impious meddling of secular power in the divine realm of God, often due to the efforts of a diabolically inspired cabal of Arianomaniac advisors.⁴⁵ Yet it is important to note there was considerable latitude and diversity in various attitudes towards the emperor: favorable assessment of the emperor did not necessarily imply an “Arian” one, as the statements in the *Chronicon Paschale* and evidence of Cyril of Jerusalem demonstrate. Likewise criticism of the emperor was not only the purview of a Nicene perspective. Varieties of opinion existed based on the twists and turns of imperial and theological parties in the fourth century. Athanasius

⁴⁵ For a discussion of the shift in assessment of imperial authority by various parties, see Vaggione, 201–202, where he discusses both Athanasius’ and Hilary’s changed attitudes towards Constantius; see also discussion in Barnes, 63–64 and 112–114; and Hanson, 315–325.

wavered in his assessment of Constantius based on the current status of his relationship with the emperor. Just as we must acknowledge diversity and development in theological categories, so do facile notions of Constantine or Constantius as either solely “Nicene” or “Arian” emperors and subsequently motivated by these historical categories likewise need to be reexamined.

Rufinus plays a fundamental role in these subsequent categorizations of Constantine as a pious and “orthodox” emperor and Constantius as a rank “Arian.” This is an aspect of Rufinus’ *Ecclesiastical History* which has not been a part of the recent evaluation of his work, other than to criticize perceived “errors” in this regard. Thus the fact that Rufinus dates the readmission of Arius to communion at the Council of Jerusalem and the first exile of Athanasius to the reign of Constantius has often been written off as a blatant chronological error by Rufinus.⁴⁶ Yet a different perspective emerges if one looks at these chronological “errors” against a larger backdrop of imperial identity in relationship to “Arianism.”

At the end of 10.1, Rufinus begins his construction of the proper role and function of the “Nicene” emperor, one which will continue throughout the course of Books 10–11. Word of the controversy in Egypt at last reached Constantine, the “religious emperor” who was conscientiously looking after the affairs of the church.⁴⁷ Rufinus draws a direct contrast between Arius and Constantine. Arius is described as “religious in appearance and aspect rather than virtue,”⁴⁸ but teaching doctrines that are deformed (*pravus*). Constantine, as opposed to Arius, is in his essence *religiosus*, and there is no disjunction between his inward piety and his actions: his religiosity extends to his care for the church. The pious emperor thus consults the bishops and subsequently calls a council to be held in Nicaea. There is no mention of other problems in the church, such as the Melitian schism

⁴⁶ In his commentary, Amidon, while continuing the critique of Rufinus’ chronology which dates back to Socrates, notes that perhaps Rufinus had a larger motive behind his writing, without further exploring this possibility. See Amidon, 50, endnote 25: “Rufinus’ chronology is badly and perhaps deliberately muddled.” See also Amidon, 51, endnote 31: “Despite what Rufinus says, the Council of Tyre was held in 335 during Constantine’s reign, and it was Constantine who banished him at the end of it. Rufinus may be simply trying to shift the responsibility for this act onto his son.”

⁴⁷ Rufinus, *EH* 10.1: “Sermo usque ad aures religiosi principis, quippe qui omnio studio et diligentia curaret, quae nostra sunt, pervenit.”

⁴⁸ Amidon translation; “vir specie et forma magis, quam virtute religiosus.”

or questions concerning the dating of Easter (though they are mentioned later). The essential picture of the role of the emperor as put forth in 10.1 is that the pious emperor shows concern for the church and operates with the advice of his bishops to take action against the teachings of Arius. The Council of Nicaea condemns Arius, and in doing so Rufinus advances several other particular themes. These include noting the deeds of various holy men, and contrasting the simplicity of the Nicene faith as opposed to the disputative element of heresy and the finery of the philosophers.⁴⁹ Rufinus in particular notes the story of an anonymous confessor who confounds one of the philosophers who had been holding debates outside of the Council's meeting place and convinces him to convert to Christianity. The result of the Council is the restoration of peace to the church:

then everything was duly settled and the peace and faith of the churches
was preserved, one and the same, in the East and in the West.⁵⁰

Thus the pious emperor Constantine, acting in consort with his bishops, was able to restore harmony throughout the church and condemn false doctrine.

Rufinus continues this emphasis on the piety of Constantine in his description of the discovery of the Cross by Helena. The material on Helena is introduced to develop Rufinus' portrait of Constantine; his piety is a reflection of his mother's. Rufinus notes that Helena was "matchless in faith, devotion and generosity,"⁵¹ and a "pious woman."⁵² Helena is described as *religiosa* just as her son Constantine has likewise been described as *religiosus*. Constantine and Helena are

⁴⁹ Rufinus, *EH*, 10.2–5. On the Council of Nicaea, see Thélamon, 436–440; for a discussion of the holy men Paphnutius and Spyridon, see 376–378 and 403–406, respectively. See also the discussion in Richard Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order*, 191–199. Lim's argument is essentially in agreement with Thélamon's general perception of Rufinus. He also argues that the portrayal of Nicaea fit into Rufinus' larger hagiographic purpose: "Thus for Rufinus, hagiography took on the additional role of polemic against heretics (Lim, 199)." As noted above, while essentially agreeing with Thélamon's (and by extension Lim's) understanding of the role of the miraculous in Rufinus, nonetheless this hagiographic emphasis should not curtail explicating a larger historiographic purpose to the work as a whole.

⁵⁰ Rufinus, *EH*, 10.6; PL 21: "Ecclesiarum pax et fides in Orientis atque Occidentis partibus una atque eadem servabatur."

⁵¹ Rufinus, *EH*, 10.7; PL 21: 475: "foemina incomparabilis fide et religione animi, ac magnificentia singulari."

⁵² Rufinus, *EH*, 10.7; PL 21: 476: "religiosa femina."

marked by this similar piety, and Rufinus makes the parallel clear by concluding that Helena was “the sort of person whose son Constantine would be.”

The story of the discovery of the Cross follows this description of Helena’s piety. Helena, led by divine visions to Jerusalem, goes to a place indicated to her by revelation. Eusebius gives us an account of Helena’s journey to Palestine and Jerusalem, but does not mention the discovery of the Cross, only her benefactions to churches.⁵³ In his letter to Constantius, Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of the discovery of the Cross without mention of Helena.⁵⁴ Ambrose is the first to include a mention of Helena in the discovery of the Cross.⁵⁵ Writing shortly after Ambrose’s account of the discovery of the Cross, in Rufinus Helena also figures prominently. As he is wont to do, Rufinus adds a touch of the miraculous to the event. Rather than recognizing the inscription on the top of the Cross, which for Rufinus is not sufficient to determine which is the Lord’s, it is a miracle which reveals the authentic Cross from that of the two thieves. A sick woman is brought to the scene and touched by various fragments; the one that heals her is the true Cross. As in Ambrose’s account, Helena makes gifts of the relics found there to her son, in particular the nails of the Cross, which Constantine has made into a bridle.

Thus we can see that along with Thélamon’s emphasis on the miraculous as indicating the presence and hand of God in the church, to limit discussion of Rufinus’ history to only hagiographic interpretations fails to notice other apologetic elements in the work. The miraculous in the story of the discovery of the Cross also serves to further Rufinus’ portrayal of the piety of Constantine. The divine favor which rested on her and directed her to the discovery of the Cross furthermore was also evident in the deeds of her son. In the next paragraph Rufinus discusses Constantine’s military victories against the Goths and Sarmatians, noting that “the more he submitted to God in a spirit of religion and humility, the more God

⁵³ Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, 3.42–43.

⁵⁴ For text of Cyril’s letter see Joseph Rupp, *Cyrilli Opera* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1967), 2.434–436.

⁵⁵ Ambrose, “On the Death of Theodosius,” 45–47. In Ambrose’s account Helena recognizes Jesus’ cross from the INRI inscription on the crossbar.

subjected everything to him.”⁵⁶ In addition to these victories, Constantine also corresponded with Antony, requesting that the ascetic intercede on his behalf before God.⁵⁷ Rufinus tells us that “he longed to make himself acceptable to God not only by his own merits and his mother’s devotion (*ac religione matris*), but through the intercession of the saints.”⁵⁸ Rufinus’s depiction of Helena and her actions provided another way to elaborate on the piety of Constantine, along with other particularly Rufinian themes of the miraculous and the power of the holy man.

After a description of the expansion of Christianity to Ethiopia and Georgia,⁵⁹ Rufinus returns to his depiction of the Emperor Constantine. Rufinus begins 10.12 by noting the death of Helena, who had been so instrumental in passing along her piety to her son. With the death of Helena Rufinus articulates a different dynamic in the imperial household, one that was to have a long life in Nicene and non-Nicene historical circles: the influence of an anonymous Arian presbyter on the court of Constantine and Constantius to explain the shifts in imperial policy.

IV. FRACTURED CHRONOLOGY IN THE DEATH OF CONSTANTINE AND PORTRAYAL OF CONSTANTIUS

The events surrounding the death of Constantine are an important element in the creation of historiographic discourse in both Nicene and non-Nicene faith communities. The necessity of claiming Constantine as a “Nicene” emperor, shorn of the complexity of theological parties and the fluidity in doctrinal categories, becomes determinative in shaping the subsequent portrayal of Constantius and the history of the “Arian” controversy.

To put in mildly, there are some curious elements in Rufinus’ recounting of the last years of Constantine.⁶⁰ Rufinus combined atten-

⁵⁶ Rufinus, *EH*, 10.8; PL 21: 477: “Et quanto magis se religiosius ac humilius Deo subjecerat, tanto amplius ei Deus universa subdebat.”

⁵⁷ Here Rufinus is following Athanasius, *Life of Antony*, 81.

⁵⁸ Rufinus, PL 21: 477.

⁵⁹ Rufinus, *EH*, 10.9–12.

⁶⁰ For an account of the events surrounding Constantine’s death, see Garth Fowden, “The Last Days of Constantine: Oppositional Versions and their Influence,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 84 (1994), 146–170.

tion to detail in certain places with a blatant distortion of historical fact in others, both undergirded by a particular apologetic purpose. Rufinus sets the last years of Constantine in motion in 10.12, noting the death of his mother: “After Helena, the mother of the religious sovereign, had passed from this light . . .”⁶¹ Reminding us of the influence his pious mother had, Rufinus then introduces the next influential element on the emperor. In consoling his sister Constantia, the widow of Licinius, Constantine met a certain presbyter “who covertly supported the Arian party.”⁶² This presbyter tells a different version of the events in Alexandria to Constantia. He argues that Alexander reacted out of jealousy to Arius’ popularity in condemning him in Alexandria. Constantia falls ill, and when Constantine visits his sister her dying wish is that he “receive the presbyter into his friendship.” Her concern is more than just the fate of Arius: she feared that her brother’s empire would incur divine disfavor if the innocent were punished, i.e. Arius.

Thus in Rufinus’ account it is Constantia’s dying wish and the influence wielded by an unnamed presbyter that set into motion the events surrounding Arius’ restoration to communion. There is no discussion of the events which followed the Council of Nicaea nor of the fact that Arius was initially restored to communion in Nicomedia in 328.⁶³ Rufinus passes over these actions of Constantine in restoring Arius to communion by a profession of faith and subsequent affirmation of a council of local bishops. Instead he paints a different picture. In Rufinus, Constantine takes no direct action to restore Arius; he is only described as “amazed” (*miratus*) that Arius’ opinions reflect that of Nicaea, and places the question of restoring Arius before the council about to meet in Jerusalem for the dedication of the church built there. The Council of Jerusalem restores Arius, who returns to Alexandria. There is no mention of the death of Alexander and election of Athanasius, nor of the charges against Athanasius by the Council of Tyre which were referred to the Council of Jerusalem. In fact, Athanasius has not yet entered the narrative apart from a

⁶¹ Rufinus, *EH*, 10.12; PL 21: 482: “Posteaquam religiosi Principis mater Helena ex hac luce discessit . . .”

⁶² Rufinus, *EH*, 10.12; PL 21: 483: “latenter partibus Arii faventem.”

⁶³ For a discussion of the Council of Nicomedia, see Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 229–230, and *Athanasius and Constantius*, 17–18. See also Hanson, *Search*, 176–178, who refers to this gathering as a “second session” of the Council of Nicaea.

brief mention of his presence at the Council of Nicaea. The complexity of ecclesiastical politics is replaced with the fictitious invention of an “Arian” presbyter working through connections in the royal family to have Arius restored.⁶⁴

It is at this point in Rufinus’ version of events that Constantine dies. Rufinus preserves certain facts correctly, such as the number of years in Constantine’s reign and the place of death. Yet he both leaves out other aspects and deliberately falsifies additional elements. Like other Nicene writers, he omits any mention of Constantine’s baptism by Eusebius of Nicomedia. Furthermore he builds on the fable of the anonymous presbyter. Rufinus tells us that Constantine established the succession to the empire in his will: “having left his children written in his will as heirs in succession of the Roman world.”⁶⁵ This will is introduced to establish the succession despite the fact that Constantine already prepared for this: he proclaimed his sons Caesars in 335, two years before his actual death. Rufinus’ introduction of the will functions as yet another way in which the anonymous presbyter preserves his influence over the royal family. It is precisely this anonymous presbyter to whom Constantine entrusts his will with the division of the empire contained in it. The presbyter is bound by oath not to hand the will to anyone but Constantius. Upon Constantius’ arrival, the presbyter hands over the will. According to Rufinus, Constantius is so grateful for the portion of the empire attributed to him and in such a great debt to the presbyter who preserved the will containing this information that he allowed himself to be subject to him:

The emperor in his desire for the realm was on account of this favor so bound to him [the presbyter] that, anxious as he was to govern others, he cheerfully allowed himself to be governed by him. From that time on, having subjugated the emperor to himself, he [the presbyter] began to speak about restoring Arius and to urge him to compel the priests⁶⁶ who were reluctant to agree.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ For a discussion on the role of women in the spread of heresy, see Daniel Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*, 57–79, and Virginia Burrus, “The Heretical Woman as Symbol in Alexander, Athanasius, Epiphanius, and Jerome,” *Harvard Theological Review* 84 (1991), 229–248.

⁶⁵ Rufinus, *EH* 10.12, PL 21: 484: “liberis de successione Romani orbis testamento haeredibus scriptis.”

⁶⁶ Rufinus consistently refers to bishops as “sacerdotes” rather than “episcopi” throughout his additions to the *Ecclesiastical History*.

⁶⁷ Rufinus, *EH* 10.12, PL 21: 484.

This anonymous presbyter has yet one more important role to play: he introduces Eusebius of Nicomedia to Constantius. Up to this point, Eusebius of Nicomedia's significance at the Council of Nicaea and afterwards have been ignored by Rufinus. Rufinus mentions him briefly as the one behind the insincere subscription to the creed of Nicaea by the supporters of Arius.⁶⁸ According to Rufinus, Eusebius "became friendly to the sovereign through the offices of the presbyter" and through that relationship sought to effect the restoration of Arius and the revocation of the Council of Nicaea.⁶⁹ The anonymous presbyter thus allowed Rufinus to place Eusebius at center stage in the restoration of Arius to communion and prevented any discussion of Eusebius having influence over the pious Constantine. In Rufinus' account it was Eusebius who summoned a council to Constantinople, not Constantine, who in reality was very much alive and who in fact gathered the council in 335. In turn Rufinus tells us that it was Eusebius who pressured Alexander of Constantinople to receive Arius into communion.

Rufinus preserves the dramatic Athanasian account of the prayers of Alexander of Constantinople in the face of a forced reception of Arius into communion.⁷⁰ Yet he continues with his substitution of Eusebius for Constantine as the main player in this story, describing how Eusebius "like the standard bearer of an army of heretics,"⁷¹ marched with Arius to the church. Rufinus follows Athanasius as a source in describing the death of Arius as the just retribution of God brought on by the prayer of the pious Alexander. Yet as he did with his version of the restoration of Arius, Rufinus also continues his apologetic for Constantine by perpetuating his increasingly complicated historical fabrications. Rufinus tells us that the "heretics" were fearful that this obvious judgment by God on Arius might sway Constantius from their cause and incur his wrath.⁷² Eusebius of

⁶⁸ Rufinus, *EH* 10.5: "The chief designer of this pretence was Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia."

⁶⁹ Rufinus, *EH* 10.13, PL 21: 485: "Sed Eusebius qui apud Nicomediam erat . . . et Principi per presbyterum familiaris effectus, revolare omnia, atque in irritum revocare Concilii gesta molitur."

⁷⁰ See Athanasius, *Letter to Serapion on the death of Arius*, 3–4, for the initial version of this restoration of Arius.

⁷¹ Rufinus, *EH* 10.13, PL 21: 485: "Eusebius cum suis omnibus velut haeretici belli signifer . . ."

⁷² Rufinus, *EH* 10.13: "but the heretics met together, fearful that the affair would be reported to the emperor Constantius just as it happened, and that not only

Nicomedia, however, managed to conceal the death of Arius through his influence with the eunuchs, who were already on his side, in an agreed-upon version of Arius' death. The levels of apologetic are ironically intertwined: in his own fabrication of the circumstances of Arius' death to suppress an unacceptable historical narrative, Rufinus tells us that Eusebius of Nicomedia concocts a fabricated version of events to hide an unacceptable truth from the emperor.

Rufinus continues this motif of deception and secret influence, begun with the anonymous presbyter, throughout his version of the events of Constantius' reign. We see this in another deliberate misrepresentation of facts concerning the Council of Tyre and the banishment of Athanasius. Rufinus informs us that after the death of Constantine, certain bishops conspired with the palace eunuchs to prevent Athanasius from having access to Constantius, fearful that he would teach the emperor the truth. This combined force of bishops and eunuchs then presented various charges against Athanasius, including the severed arm of Arsenius.⁷³ The discrepancies in historical fact are beyond simple mistake or bad chronology: the death of Constantine occurred in 337; Rufinus chooses to date the Council of Tyre as taking place after the Council of Jerusalem, in the reign of Constantius. In his translation notes Amidon vaguely acknowledges that "Rufinus may simply be trying to shift the responsibility for this act [Athanasius' exile] onto his [Constantine's] son."⁷⁴ Amidon's comment, while on target, nonetheless fails to take into account the complexity of Rufinus' work: he is attempting to shift the blame, but as part of a larger purpose of reconstructing the role of the imperium in the "Arian" controversy and the influences on Constantine and Constantius. Rufinus is distorting historical dates as part of a larger historiographic purpose. By choosing to describe the exile of Athanasius in this manner, he is able to both shift the blame and perpetuate his theme of external influence on Constantius by various anonymous persons, whether presbyters, bishops, or eunuchs. By continually referring to unnamed persons, Rufinus is thus able to suppress one narrative and substitute his own.

would he disown their perfidy, in which he had been so cleverly ensnared, but would also visit upon the authors of his deception stern treatment through his imperial power."

⁷³ For a reconstruction of the Arsenius affair and the Council of Tyre, see Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 21–33.

⁷⁴ Amidon, 51.

Postponing for now his portrayal of Athanasius, we can also see how Rufinus constructs an alternative reading of the proceedings from the Council of Tyre. First of all, in Rufinus' world this council takes place in the reign of Constantius, though Constantine was in reality very much alive when it was held. He also chooses to begin the council's proceedings with a confrontation between Paphnutius, the holy confessor who also figured prominently at Nicaea, and Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem. According to Rufinus, Paphnutius convinces Maximus to leave the council and join communion with Athanasius. Yet in actuality Maximus voted to depose Athanasius. In addition, rather than secretly departing the council to avoid its verdict, Rufinus has Athanasius flee for his life from an angry mob at the advice of the comes Archelaus. Since Constantine in this construction of reality is dead, there is no mention of Athanasius' flight to Constantinople and eventual banishment by the emperor himself. Rather the blame is squarely laid at the feet of Constantius, in conjunction with the unnamed episcopal enemies of Athanasius and in the midst of popular violence. These bishops "concoct" the minutes of the Council which they compel other bishops to accept, with Constantius' approval.⁷⁵

Rufinus' portrayal of imperial authority during the "Arian" controversy as continuously under the influence of forces hostile to Athanasius is not only confined to the house of Constantine. Following the death of Constantius, Julian appears at first to supply a necessary corrective: he rescinds the exile of the bishops "as though critical of what Constantius had done."⁷⁶ In Rufinus' account it is only later, in preparing for war against the Persians, that Julian reveals his true beliefs, showing himself a persecutor of the church by forbidding Christians to teach and excluding them from civil and military posts. Yet despite these differences, like Constantius Julian is turned against Athanasius through baleful influences. Rather than anonymous presbyters or palace eunuchs, Julian instead falls under the sway of the coterie of soothsayers at court:

⁷⁵ Rufinus, *EH* 10.18, PL 21: 491: "Et gesta in hunc modum facta per orbem terrae mitentes, ad sceleris sui consensum, Imperatore cogente, caeteros Episcopos perpulerunt."

⁷⁶ Rufinus, *EH* 10.28, PL 21: 497–98. Rufinus is the only church historian to ascribe this motive for Julian's action.

they declared they would accomplish nothing by their arts unless he had first got rid of Athanasius, who stood in the way of them all.⁷⁷

That a pattern is being repeated Rufinus makes clear with the repeated use of the word *iterum*: “once again an army was sent, once again officers, once again the church was assaulted.”⁷⁸ Despite the initial sense that Julian was somehow correcting Constantius’ policy, for Rufinus there was a similar pattern of influence from enemies of Athanasius, and similar results, despite the outward appearances between the two emperors. For Rufinus, the influences on each of these three emperors manifests itself directly in their involvement in the church. Constantine is led astray by a deceitful presbyter, usurping the proper authority of bishops; Constantius by political advisors and false bishops; and Julian, by pagan holy men, reflecting his apostasy and persecution of the church.

The pattern is different in regards to the next emperor, Jovian, who is seen by Rufinus as a supporter of the Nicene cause. Rufinus offers a very favorable assessment of Jovian, and correspondingly paints a much rosier picture of the peace treaty signed with the Persians than was the case in reality.⁷⁹ Regarding Athanasius, Rufinus explicitly suggests that the reason for Constantius’ death and fall from power was his attitude towards Athanasius. He notes that Jovian “did not act heedlessly like Constantius; warned by his predecessor’s fall, he summoned Athanasius with a respectful and most dutiful letter.”⁸⁰ Furthermore, not only did Jovian show favor to Athanasius, he was willing to accept his bishops’ advice on proper governance of the church. Rufinus tells us that Jovian “received from him [Athanasius] a creed and a plan for ordering the churches.”⁸¹ A hint of what might have been is contained in Rufinus’ summary sentence to the chapter. He writes that “an early death ruined these so religious and happy beginnings.”⁸² This is the first mention of the religiosity or the piety of the ruler since Constantine. For Rufinus Jovian

⁷⁷ Rufinus, *EH* 10.34, PL 21: 502.

⁷⁸ Rufinus, *EH* 10.35.

⁷⁹ For a contrasting picture of the peace treaty, see Ammianus Marcellinus, 25.7.

⁸⁰ Rufinus, *EH* 11.1, PL 21: 508: “*Nec tamen incute, ut Constantius egerat, sed lapsu praedecessoris admonitus, honorificis et officiosissimis litteris Athanasium requirit.*”

⁸¹ Rufinus, *EH* 11.1.

⁸² Rufinus, *EH* 11.1, PL 21: 508: “*Sed haec tam pia et tam laeta principia mors immatura corrupit.*”

clearly had the potential to follow the proper influences, i.e. Athanasius and Nicene orthodoxy, and live a religious life as had Constantine.

Postponing a discussion of Valens to the following section, Rufinus completes his theme of proper exercise of imperial authority in his portrayal of Theodosius. Rufinus chooses to close his *Ecclesiastical History* with Theodosius' accession to the throne following Valentinian's death, after a long digression concerning paganism and the destruction of the Serapeum.⁸³ In his descriptions of Theodosius, Rufinus draws a direct contrast to Constantius and a parallel to Constantine. For Rufinus, Theodosius is a "pious emperor." The language used is the same as in his description of Constantine: *religiosus princeps*.⁸⁴ Rather than heeding the advice of anonymous heretical advisors, Rufinus explains away the controversial aspects of Theodosius' rule to diabolical sources. In particular he explains the reason for the Thessalonica massacre to the devil's influence: "During this time the pious sovereign was vilely besmirched by the demon's cunning."⁸⁵

In regards to theological matters, Rufinus draws parallels to Constantine, showing that Theodosius followed the advice of proper influences in direct contrast to Constantius. Theodosius cultivated close relationships with bishops and demonstrated his "faith, piety, and generosity."⁸⁶ Previously Rufinus described Helena as faithful and pious, and, like Theodosius, generous in her benefactions to the church. In addition to these similarities to the house of Constantine, God blessed Theodosius with proper guidance: he inspired a monk named John to serve as his advisor.⁸⁷ Rather than unnamed Arian presbyters, Theodosius seeks his counsel from an ascetic holy man.

⁸³ Rufinus introduces Theodosius and initial incidents in his reign in 11.14–18 before beginning an extended discussion of paganism in 11.23–30. See the detailed discussion in Thélamon, 157–273.

⁸⁴ Rufinus, *EH* 11.18, PL 21: 525.

⁸⁵ Rufinus, *EH* 11.18, PL 21: 525: "*Per idem tempus subreptione quadam daemonis, turpis macula religioso principi inusta est.*"

⁸⁶ Rufinus, *EH* 11.19; PL 21: 526: "*fide, religione, et munificentia.*"

⁸⁷ Rufinus, 11.19: "For these reasons [zeal against idolatry, expelling "Arians" from the churches in Constantinople] he [Theodosius] was so dear to God that divine Providence granted him a special favor: it filled with the prophetic spirit a monk named John in the Thebaid, so that by his counsel and replies he could learn whether it would be better to remain at peace or go to war." See also Rufinus, 11.32, in regards to Theodosius' decision to attack the usurper Eugenius: "But first he sought God's will through John, the monk we mentioned earlier. He was the one who foretold to him the prior bloodless victory over Maximus; this time he promised another victory, but not without great bloodshed on both sides."

Thus in the concluding chapters of his *Ecclesiastical History* Rufinus provides a portrayal of Theodosius as the proper successor to Constantine, the original sponsor of Nicene orthodoxy. He is described in similar language as Constantine and Helena, and, unlike Constantius, chooses the proper advisors to guide him in his ecclesiastical and military policy. In addition to the larger hagiographic purposes outlined by Thélamon, in Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History* we can see how the dating of historical events and the manner in which he adapts Athanasian source materials are also an important element of his historiography. Rufinus is not only writing a hagiographic narrative of God's providential intervention in the life of the church, he is also suppressing alternative historical narratives from the same period. There is a larger purpose to what has often been characterized as Rufinus' "poor" attention to historical detail. Having constructed the attributes of the proper emperor, we now examine the second major aspect of Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History*, and the key element in a paradigm shift away from the Eusebian model previously outlined: Rufinus is not only writing a hagiographic history, he is actively involved in creating holy men.

V. THE MAKING OF A HOLY MAN: ATHANASIUS IN RUFINUS

Having preserved the undefiled memory of the pious emperor Constantine, Rufinus is free to lay the blame for the banishment of Athanasius at the feet of Constantius. In the process of doing so, Rufinus also fulfills yet another important role in the development of Nicene historiography: helping to create the mythic portrait of Athanasius as part of his larger purposes in establishing a paradigm of authority for Nicene Christianity. Similar to the scholarly debate on the category of "Arianism", as noted above, the interpretation of Athanasius' role in the theological debates of the fourth century is in a state of revision.⁸⁸

⁸⁸ See discussion in Chapter 3, footnote 1. See also Hanson, *Search*, 239–240 for a selection of historical panegyric on Athanasius. Among the more influential is Harnack's comment that "if we measure him by the standard of his time, we can discover nothing ignoble or weak about him (*History of Dogma* 3.62)." Likewise significant is Gwatkin's assessment that "Athanasius . . . was philosopher, statesman, and saint all in one. Few great men have been so free from littleness or weakness (*Arian Controversy*, 49)." Even Gibbon, who had only lukewarm affection for the

As the “Arian” controversy progressed through Constantius’ reign, Athanasius’ role in the theological debates changed substantially. Intimately involved in the debates of the 340s and 350s, Athanasius retreats from center stage during his last exile under Constantius.⁸⁹ It was during this exile that the theological debate took a different turn. The party of Basil of Ancyra emerged, and Constantius attempted to enforce theological compromise through a homoian creed. During the same decade Aetius and Eunomius rose to prominence and began teaching their doctrine of heterousios. After his return from exile in 362, Athanasius was willing to form alliances with former enemies in order to form a united front against the homoians and the followers of Aetius and Eunomius. As Barnes notes, “Between 356 and 362 the exiled bishop was transformed from a proud prelate with a dubious reputation into an elder statesman renowned for his historic defense of Nicene orthodoxy.”⁹⁰ Returning from exile, the theological debate in a sense had passed him by. The so-called “settlement” of the “Arian” controversy was the work of a group of theologians responding to a different theological challenge. The Cappadocians built on Athanasian categories of οὐσία and ὑπόστασις, but did so in a different context, in response to the theology of Aetius and Eunomius. In Barnes’ words, in his later years Athanasius “played no significant part either in shaping the Neo-Nicene orthodoxy which was to triumph at the second ecumenical council or in more mundane ecclesiastical politics outside of Egypt.”⁹¹ After the composition

Christianity of the fourth and fifth, centuries, has a favorable assessment of Athanasius. Hanson summarizes Athanasius role thusly: “But we cannot overlook his constant attempts to represent the case against him as a thinly-disguised doctrinal opposition when in fact it was invariably founded, not on his theological views, but on the manner in which he administered his see. No one ever seriously accused Athanasius of heresy, but his writings suggest time and time again that accusations of misconduct as a bishop should be ignored in order to concentrate upon the doctrinal issues.” *Search*, 244.

⁸⁹ See Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*, 8.

⁹⁰ Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 152.

⁹¹ Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 164. Hanson also notes the distinct shift in theological activity after Athanasius’ last major theological work, the so-called *Tomos ad Antiochenos* of 362; see Hanson, *Search*, 675: “But his [Athanasius’] immediate heirs in the work of finding a viable Christian doctrine of God did little to modify or develop his doctrine in fruitful directions. In fact initiative and creative activity in this task had even before Athanasius’ death passed to another group of theologians living in quite a different part of the empire, those three men who are known as the Cappadocian fathers.”

of his *Tomos ad Antiochenos* of 362, Athanasius did not write another substantive historical or theological work.

Thus we can see that Athanasius had a rather ambiguous place in the history of the church from 362 onward. Later Nicene theologians followed in his wake and were undoubtedly influenced by him, but rarely quote his works or mention his personal role in the struggle against “Arianism.” Ambrose, the leading defender of Nicene orthodoxy in the West, mentions Athanasius only twice.⁹² While Gregory of Nazianzus supplied an oration on the occasion of his death⁹³ and Basil wrote several letters to the bishop,⁹⁴ their works convey respect and admiration but fall short of assigning to him the central role as savior of Nicene orthodoxy. It is later historians who simplified the facts of the fourth century, and Rufinus plays a large role in this. Rufinus reworked his received traditions concerning Athanasius and presented a carefully crafted and highly influential portrait of the bishop. Rufinus, in writing the Nicene history of the fourth century, plays the most important role in establishing the legendary aspect of Athanasius. He does so in the same fashion in which he dealt with Constantine: by purposely recasting historical events and supplementing them with traditions he has either received or fabricated to create an idealized portrait of the bishop as a powerful holy man chosen by God.

Athanasius is first introduced at the Nicene Council. In the context of his *Ecclesiastical History*, Rufinus portrays Athanasius as another of the notable holy men present at the Council. Just prior to his mention of Athanasius he has told us of the miracles of Paphnutius and Spyridon. Rufinus concludes these miracle stories with the summary statement that

There were, then, in those times as well very many shining examples of such men in the Lord’s churches, of whom quite a few were present at the Council.

Rufinus directly links the young deacon with these holy confessors, telling us that “Athanasius was there too.”⁹⁵ Furthermore Rufinus supplies the fact that Athanasius was “aiding the old man [Alexander]

⁹² Hanson, *Search*, 667.

⁹³ Gregory, *Oration* 21.

⁹⁴ Basil, *Epistles* 66, 67, 69, 80, 82.

⁹⁵ Rufinus, *EH* 10.5, PL 21: 472.

with his assiduous advice.”⁹⁶ Yet this reference to Athanasius’ presence is in itself problematic; nowhere in his writings does Athanasius tell us of his presence at the Council of Nicaea or of his direct role there.⁹⁷ It is Rufinus who explicitly places Athanasius at the Council, accords him an important role in serving as Alexander’s advisor, and through the placement of this fact in his overall narrative links Athanasius with the prominent holy men also present at Nicaea. We can see how Rufinus’ telling of this story complements his larger hagiographic purposes.

In Rufinus’ account, Athanasius largely disappears after this brief mention in 10.5. As noted above, Rufinus is primarily concerned with his portrayal of Constantine and the expansion of Christianity to Ethiopia and Georgia. Athanasius has a role to play in this expansion, which serves to further Rufinus’ portrayal of Constantine. Rufinus informs us that Athanasius is the one who consecrates Frumentius for his missionary work, noting that Athanasius “had recently received the priesthood [i.e., the episcopate].”⁹⁸ Once again Rufinus has deliberately altered the facts to serve his larger purpose. In 10.20 he presents the mission to Axum as taking place under the reign of Constantine, when in fact it took place almost thirty years later under Constantius.⁹⁹ The credit for the expansion of Christianity to this land is thus credited to Constantine, not Constantius. Up to this point that has been absolutely no mention of the Council of Tyre and Athanasius’ involvement there, despite profuse mentions of this in Athanasius’ own works, and despite the fact that the Council of Tyre is a necessary precursor to the Council of Jerusalem, which Rufinus does mention. In order to accomplish his objective in drawing a parallel between Constantine and Constantius, Rufinus deliberately alters information leading up to the Council of Jerusalem. This is why Athanasius plays little role in the *Ecclesiastical History* after his introduction in 10.5. It is only after the death of Constantine

⁹⁶ Rufinus, PL 21: 472: “aderat consiliis senem quamplurimis juvans.”

⁹⁷ His presence is mentioned indirectly in a quotation from the circular letter of the Bishops of Egypt quoted in the *Defense Against the Arians*, which never appeared in Athanasius’ lifetime and was included in codices after his death to faithfully preserve his writings. See Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 6, and especially 192–194, where he summarizes scholarly consensus on the work and outlines the development of its composition.

⁹⁸ Rufinus, *EH* 10,10; PL 21: 479: “nuper sacerdotium suscepere.”

⁹⁹ Thélamon, 62; Amidon, 47.

that Athanasius returns to the narrative, to serve a different function: as the divine chosen holy man to stand in opposition to heretical emperors. In 10.15, having presented his understanding of the role of the emperors Constantine and Constantius in the “Arian” controversy, Rufinus begins his hagiographic portrayal of Athanasius.

Rufinus begins this account by reminding us of Athanasius’ presence at the Council of Nicaea. Previously Rufinus had informed us that Athanasius had provided wise counsel to his aged bishop. In his second mention of Athanasius’ role at Nicaea, Rufinus expands this characterization and gives Athanasius direct credit for the work of the Council itself. Rufinus notes that it was by Athanasius’ counsel to Alexander that “the tricks and deceits of the heretics had been unremittingly exposed.”¹⁰⁰ Yet in doing so the seeds of the future controversy were also sown. Because of his reputation from the Council of Nicaea, the “heretics” in Alexandria had every reason to fear Athanasius as bishop, and subsequently sought to depose him.¹⁰¹ Thus once again historical realities have been truncated through Rufinus’ reframing of the “Arian” controversy. Athanasius’ later construal of the charges against him as the work of his doctrinal opponents is read back by Rufinus into the proceedings of the council itself, and setting the stage for Rufinus to portray him as defender of Nicene orthodoxy.

In the remainder of Book 10 and in the opening chapters of Book 11 Rufinus recasts Athanasius from the elder statesman, an important influence but whose theological time has passed, into the Nicene holy man handed down to posterity. After noting the conspiracy which formed against him, Rufinus recounts Athanasius’ early years.¹⁰² A figure as important as Athanasius undoubtedly deserved an account of his youth, as Rufinus, from his reworking of Eusebius’ portrayal of Origen, was well aware. In Rufinus we find the story of the young Athanasius playing bishop on the beach with his friends, attracting the notice of Alexander, who takes the boy into his care and sees to his education. This hagiographic legend becomes an important part of the mythology surrounding Athanasius, and is picked up and

¹⁰⁰ Rufinus, *EH* 10.15, PL 21: “cujus suggestionibus haereticorum doli ac fallaciae vigilanter detegebantur.”

¹⁰¹ Rufinus, 10.15.

¹⁰² Thélamon, 337.

reproduced in both Socrates and Sozomen. There is some question as to whether this story originated in Gelasius of Caesarea's *Ecclesiastical History*.¹⁰³ Regardless of its origin, Rufinus' choice to include the story and to place it within the historical framework he is creating serves his larger purpose of creating the holy man/bishop Athanasius. While Thélamon rightly notes the hagiographic function of the story, noting in particular the biblical motif of Athanasius as a second Samuel,¹⁰⁴ she is again limited by her focus on Rufinus' hagiographic goals. Thélamon discusses the story of Athanasius' youth as part of a larger theme of divine election, drawing parallels to the later account of the election of Ambrose. Yet Rufinus portrays Athanasius not only as one divinely chosen, but one endowed with a certain holy power through that election.

This manifestation of divine power in Athanasius is revealed in a manner often overlooked in the description of him playing bishop on the beach. As noted above, Thélamon has chosen to interpret the story primarily through the theme of election as expressed through biblical metaphor. Other authors have likewise noted that parallels between the story of the young Athanasius and other Graeco-Roman heroes.¹⁰⁵ Yet perhaps the most remarkable aspect of the story is often unmentioned. In Rufinus' account, Bishop Alexander takes aside the young Athanasius' playmates and asks them what they were doing. They replied they were playing the part of catechumens and that they had been baptized by Athanasius, who had been playing the part of bishop. Intrigued, Alexander then "carefully asked"¹⁰⁶ them what questions had been posed to them. After hearing their answers, Alexander conferred with the clergy who were with him, and pronounced that, since the questions had been asked and answered properly, the baptisms were valid and not to be repeated. Along with the theme of divine election, Rufinus therefore gives us a portrayal of the young Athanasius filled with doctrinal wisdom that grants him sacramental power beyond his years or official status, so

¹⁰³ For a discussion of this fragment from Gelasius, see Friedhelm Winkelmann, "Charakter und Bedeutung der Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 1 (1966), 346–385.

¹⁰⁴ Thélamon, *Paiens et Chrétiens*, 337: "c'est l'éducation d'un héros chrétien, consacré dès l'enfance au service de Dieu, comme il sera toute sa vie, et dont Samuel est le type."

¹⁰⁵ See footnote in Amidon, 51, for relevant parallels.

¹⁰⁶ "diligenter inquirens," PL 21: 487.

that his youthful baptisms were so properly performed that they were deemed valid.

Athanasius' holy power is demonstrated in different ways after his election to the see of Alexandria. In 10.16 we noted how Rufinus perpetuates his theme of Constantius' propensity to improper influences, in this case the court eunuchs, who, in collaboration with "Arian" bishops, bring accusations against Athanasius. However, according to Rufinus, their true purpose was not only to discredit Athanasius, but to prevent him from having access to the emperor. Their fear was that if he were allowed access to the emperor, Athanasius would "teach him, according to the Scriptures, the truth of the faith which they were distorting."¹⁰⁷ This is another manifestation of the power of divine wisdom in Athanasius as the holy teacher, first brought up in his youthful catechetical instruction. This motif of the holy man having the power to convince and convert is manifested in a variety of different settings. In the martyrdom account of Lucian of Antioch, so great is the emperor's fear of Lucian's persuasive powers that he interrogates him only after a screen has been set up between the two of them.¹⁰⁸ In a similar fashion, the "Arians" fear that a meeting between Athanasius and Constantius will result in the emperor's conversion.

Furthermore, in the reign of Julian the soothsayers inform the emperor that they are unable to practice their art while Athanasius was still at large: "they all alike declared that they would accomplish nothing by their arts unless he first got rid of Athanasius."¹⁰⁹ Athanasius' miraculous escape from Julian's troops is likewise attributed to the power of God resting upon him. Rather than fleeing, Athanasius turns his boat directly towards the pursuing soldiers of the emperor, telling his followers,

Do not be frightened, my children: rather let us go meet our executioner, that he may realize the one protecting us is far greater than the one pursuing us.

The count leading the troops asks Athanasius' party if they had seen the bishop. He replies that he is not far off, and the count and his

¹⁰⁷ Rufinus, 10.16; PL 21: 488.

¹⁰⁸ On the encounter between Lucian and Maximin see the *Vita* of Lucian in Bidez, 193–194.

¹⁰⁹ Rufinus, *EH* 10.34, PL 21: 502.

soldiers hurry past, “hastening in vain to capture the man he could not see before his very eyes.”¹¹⁰ Safely past the count and his troops, Athanasius returned to Alexandria where, “guarded by God’s strength,” he remained in hiding until Julian’s death. Rufinus therefore adds to the legend of Athanasius by telling us the story of his miraculous evasion of those sent to capture him, and how he was protected by God. It should not come as a surprise that this story, one which will be repeated in the later historians, also originates with Rufinus. Though Theodoret and Socrates largely reproduce the story as it appears in Rufinus, they leave out one particular detail of Rufinus’ account. While preserving the quotation from Athanasius that “this is a small cloud which will soon pass away,” and the confrontation between the party of Athanasius and the soldiers, Theodoret and Socrates leave out the explicit mention of divine power resting on Athanasius.¹¹¹

Athanasius also wielded a certain amount of power over the next “Arian” emperor, Valens. In his portrayal of the confrontations between Valens and Athanasius, Rufinus once more misrepresents the facts to serve his larger purposes. For Rufinus, Valens deliberately departed from the faith of his father Valentinian, who had been expelled by the army by Julian on account of his Christianity, and openly supports the “heretics.”¹¹² Rufinus tells us of a number of persecutions that took place under Valens, but notes that these “took place after Athanasius’ death, for while he was still alive he [Valens] was restrained as though by some divine power.”¹¹³ In Rufinus’ account, Athanasius’ power as holy man was so great so as to restrain the emperor from persecuting the church until after his death.

Thus we can see that a stylized and very particular portrait of Athanasius emerges from Rufinus’ *Ecclesiastical History*. Rufinus provides us with miraculous stories from his childhood, gives him an increasing role in the deliberations and outcomes of the Council of Nicaea, consistently portrays him as one on whom God’s election rests, and as one empowered by this election to stand up to “heretical” emperors. While later historians put less emphasis on the divine

¹¹⁰ Rufinus, *EH* 10.35.

¹¹¹ See Socrates, 3.14, and Theodoret, 3.5.

¹¹² Rufinus, *EH* 11.2.

¹¹³ Rufinus, *EH* 11.2.

aspects of Rufinus' portrayal, they nonetheless adopt the idealized portrait of Athanasius into their histories. The embattled prelate with a reputation for heavy-handedness becomes a Nicene holy man, courtesy of Rufinus.

VI. THE ROLE OF THE MONK-BISHOP IN RUFINUS

Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History* is crucial in shaping a Nicene portrait of the events of the fourth century in a variety of ways. I have already noted how Rufinus helps to fix the portraits of Constantine, Constantius, and Athanasius into the memory of the church through his blend of hagiography and factual distortion. In Book 11 Rufinus provides another piece of an increasingly complex paradigm of authority in Nicene historiography. Part of what motivated his revision of Books 1–9 of Eusebius and composition of Book 10 of his own work was loyalty to the school of Origen and the traditions of Athanasius. Common to the work of Eusebius, the anonymous “Arian” historian, and Rufinus has been a methodology in which history was an apologetic product of community of belief loyal to a particular theological tradition, whether Nicene or non-Nicene. Central to this methodology was loyalty to a teacher and the subsequent school from which the various authors descended.

In Book 11 Rufinus evidences a shift from this model of authority in the church to one which will become increasingly normative. In his portrayal of Athanasius we see the beginning of a shift in authority from the charismatic holy teacher whose power derives from his textual erudition and confessor status to the monk-bishop who embodies wisdom through ascetic practice and Scriptural study. With the increasing influence of nascent Christian monasticism, with which Rufinus himself had extensive experience, the locus of authority shifts from the teacher/exegete to the monk/ascetic. This shift is evident in Rufinus himself, who in Books 1–9 exemplifies one pattern, and in Books 10–11 creates a new one, with Athanasius and the Cappadocians as his models.

The shift in authority becomes apparent almost immediately after the death of Athanasius. In the same chapter that Rufinus tells us that Athanasius “rested in peace,” he describes how Lucius, the “Arian” pretender to the see of Alexandria, waged war against the monks in the desert:

Hence after the banishment and exile of the citizens, after the slaughter, torture, and flames with which he brought so many to their death, he turned his weapon of madness against the monasteries.

Further, Rufinus tells us that Lucius “waged war against the desert.”¹¹⁴ Just as with Julian’s assault on Athanasius, Lucius gathers force of men “as if going out against the barbarians.” Yet upon their arrival, they “witness a new kind of war.”¹¹⁵ The monks, rather than resisting, offer their necks to the sword. Rather than persecuting Athanasius, after his death Lucius turns the army against the monks of the desert, to whom the authority as protectors of orthodoxy has been shifted and where the locus of holy power now lies as martyrs. Rather than sending soldiers after Athanasius, the persecutors of the church now send them against the monks. The war metaphor has been taken from its larger context of persecution of the church and is applied to the actions taken against the monks under Valens.

With this shift after Athanasius’ death, in the next several chapters Rufinus describes the rise of monasticism and the prominent monks of the desert. Invoking himself as first-person witness,¹¹⁶ Rufinus describes the sanctity and miracles of Macarius and Didymus, among others. He also continues his theme of warfare: he notes that the monastic leaders “led the Lord’s army equipped not with mortal weapons but with religious faith.”¹¹⁷ Seeing the power of the holy men whom he persecutes, Lucius even begins to fear that his own people will rise up against him, “seeing how he had now openly declared war not on men, but on God,” by attacking and persecuting the monks.¹¹⁸ This presence of God in the lives of the holy monastics is further made explicit in Rufinus’ description of his teacher Didymus.

Rufinus tells us that God raised up Didymus in the midst of Lucius’ persecution: “the Lord lit Didymus to be like a lamp shining with divine light” and that he was “given by God for the glory of the church.”¹¹⁹ Despite his blindness Didymus continued to pray to God,

¹¹⁴ Rufinus, *EH* 11.3, PL 21: 510–11.

¹¹⁵ Rufinus, PL 21: 511: “*novaum belli speciem vident.*”

¹¹⁶ Rufinus, *EH* 11.4, PL 21: 511: “*Quae praesens vidi loquor; et eorum gesta refero, quorum in passionibus socius esse promerui.*”

¹¹⁷ Rufinus, *EH* 11.4, PL 21: 511.

¹¹⁸ Rufinus, *EH* 11.4, PL 21: 512.

¹¹⁹ Rufinus, *EH* 11.7, PL 21: 516.

not for sight, but for inner illumination. Through intense study “with God as his teacher,” Didymus eventually became head of the catechetical school in Alexandria and “won the high esteem of bishop Athanasius.”¹²⁰ Apart from human admiration, which he received, Rufinus tells us that, as one of his disciples, he “perceived . . . something divine and above human speech which sounded in those words coming from his mouth.”¹²¹ To confirm this opinion of his, Rufinus tells us that the great Antony himself, on his journey to Alexandria to express his support of Athanasius, himself consoled Didymus in his blindness and praised him for his learning. Thus holy charism rests on Didymus as teacher as it did with Athanasius as a bishop, but for different reasons. Didymus is appointed by God as a light to lighten the world during the persecutions of Lucius of Alexandria through his teaching. The dependence of all “orthodox” leaders on direct divine power, manifested in monastic and episcopal understandings of authority, is the predominant image.

Completing this introductory segment on the rise of monasticism, Rufinus provides a succession of monastics as he had previous taken pains to note the succession of bishops in various sees. As we have seen, in 11.7 Rufinus invokes the testimony of both Athanasius and Antony as evidence of the divine power inherent in the blind Didymus’ teaching. In 11.8 he again presents himself as a first-person witness and introduces a list of prominent monastics. The rise of monasticism during this period as outlined in 11.4–11.8 is interpreted by Rufinus as a clear sign of the rise of a different form of power in the face of renewed persecution. Rufinus sees the great number of holy men in the desert as a sign of God’s providence, and cites as biblical proof Romans 5:20: “where sin abounded, grace abounded more.”¹²² With the rise of monasticism, which Rufinus only introduces following the death of Athanasius, there resides a new locus of power and authority to combat a renewed wave of “Arian” persecution, first in the person of Lucius of Alexandria, and later through the emperor Valens.

The section from 11.4–11.8, establishing monasticism as God’s bulwark in the world against heresy and listing prominent monas-

¹²⁰ Rufinus, *EH* 11.7, PL 21: 516.

¹²¹ Rufinus, *EH* 11.7, PL 21: 517.

¹²² Rufinus, *EH* 11.8, PL 21: 517.

tics, sets up Rufinus' discussion in 11.9 of the Cappadocians. In this chapter we see a familiar pattern in Rufinus: deliberate distortion of fact, along with fabrication of additional events, to serve a larger purpose. This method behind Rufinus' historical writing remains a mystery to some authors; as Amidon notes in his translation, "The errors in Rufinus' biographical sketch of Basil and Gregory are so egregious as to seem almost deliberate."¹²³ Rufinus' portraits of Basil and Gregory are indeed deliberate, but it is not the result of errors. Rather they are an extension of his developing theme of authority in the church residing in the new class of monastic teachers and bishops. The two are presented as paradigms of ascetic episcopal authority, the product of direct divine intervention in the church.

After his summary chapter in 11.8, which concludes the initial introduction of monasticism and its leaders, Rufinus tells us that Cappadocia was no less fertile than the centers of monasticism in Mesopotamia, Egypt, or Edessa, and produced two exemplary leaders, Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus. Basil's younger brother Gregory is absent at this point from this discussion, since for Rufinus there are only two important Cappadocians. Rufinus takes the rough facts of their lives and presents them as scholarly ascetics along the lines of his own teacher Didymus. Rufinus rightly informs us of their noble births and studies in Athens, and notes that Basil taught rhetoric for a time.¹²⁴ Rufinus' point of departure from the facts begins with his description of the two men's entry into monasticism. According to Rufinus, Gregory prevailed upon Basil to retire with him to the monastic life: "he removed Basil from the professor's chair which he was occupying and forced him to accompany him to a monastery."¹²⁵ The opposite is actually true: it was Basil who retired to his family's estate in Annesi, leaving not his professor's chair but a fledgling ecclesiastical career, and who convinced Gregory to join him.¹²⁶

¹²³ Amidon, 93.

¹²⁴ For a discussion of Basil's family life and time at Athens, see Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 1–60.

¹²⁵ Rufinus, *EH* 11.9; PL 21: 518.

¹²⁶ Hanson, *Search*, 680. Basil left his rhetorical career behind after his baptism in 356. He, like Rufinus, toured monastic sites in Palestine and Egypt in 357, was ordained deacon, and attended the Council of Constantinople in 360 which affirmed a homoian creed as part of Basil of Ancyra's party. See also the discussion of Basil's ascetic career in Philip Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 61–92; for the role of the *Philokalia* and Origen, see 82–84.

Rufinus tells us they spent thirteen years in the monastic life, when in actuality they spent little more than a year. He also tells us that they spent this time studying Scripture, particularly noting their method of Scriptural exegesis. According to Rufinus, they interpreted Scripture not through their own skills of talents, but

from the writings and authority of those of old who were themselves known to have received the rule of understanding from apostolic tradition.¹²⁷

It would seem that initially Rufinus is portraying Basil and Gregory as rejecting their pagan backgrounds in rhetoric in order to focus exclusively on the Scriptures. Yet Rufinus notes that while they did indeed devote themselves to Scripture, they read it through the authoritative interpretation of persons whom they knew to be inheritors of apostolic tradition. Rufinus, as a disciple of Didymus, could not have been ignorant of the fact that the fruit of Basil and Gregory's time in Annesi was a collection of excerpts from Origen, the *Philokalia*.¹²⁸ In this sentence Rufinus' caution regarding the place of Origen within his writings is evident. Given the controversy in his time regarding Origen's works, Rufinus needed to find a way to demonstrate the two Cappadocians' indebtedness to the great teacher without necessarily invoking criticism or judgment. He does so in a subtle circumlocution which preserves Origen's authoritative status but also presents Basil and Gregory as standing within an apostolic tradition of Scriptural interpretation. There is a complexity to Rufinus' portrayal of Gregory and Basil which goes beyond Thélamon's thesis that he is presenting an edifying version of their lives in contrast to the portrayal of heretics.¹²⁹

¹²⁷ Rufinus, *EH* 11.9, PL 21: 518: “sed ex majorum scriptis et auctoritate sequebantur : quos et ipsos ex Apostolica successione intelligendi regulam suscepisse constabat.”

¹²⁸ For the current state of scholarship on the place of Basil and Gregory in the compilation of the *Philokalia*, see Marguerite Harl, *Sur les Écritures : Philocalie 1–20, SC 302* Paris: Cérf, 1983), 19–24. While acknowledging their study of Origen, Harl notes that one cannot tell exactly how much of the compilation they composed; see Harl, 24: “Même si nous savons que Basil et Grégoire ont beaucoup étudié l’œuvre d’Origène dans leur jeunesse, nous ne pouvons pas dire qu’ils ont composé, eux-mêmes, et ensemble, la *Philocalie*.” See also Eric Junod, *Sur le libre arbitre: Philocalie 21–27, SC 226* (Paris: Cérf), 11–13, and Rousseau. More important than the textual history of the *Philokalia* is the image that Rufinus is constructing. While modern scholarship acknowledges the layers of development in the *Philokalia*, nonetheless Rufinus would have understood Basil and Gregory to have been the chief compilers.

¹²⁹ Thélamon, 442.

In two distinct sections which follow Rufinus provides examples of how biblical study was part a divine commissioning of the two. Rufinus tells us that the two “learned as much as they needed” and that “divine providence called them to instruct the people.”¹³⁰ Yet the divine commission had different ways in which to accomplish this goal of instruction: “each was drawn by a different route to the same task.” Rufinus presents Basil as touring the countryside, essentially performing two different tasks. First he shapes the spiritual lives of the people by preaching, in particular devoting time to singing of hymns and reciting Psalms. He also provides the necessary physical structures for the communities, building monasteries, hospices, and homes for consecrated virgins. In short, his work transforms the physical and spiritual landscape of Cappadocia in the same manner that the monasteries changed the desert: the

appearance of the whole province was transformed and a great harvest of faith was reaped from what had once been barren.”¹³¹

Just as his descriptions of monasticism in 11.4–11.8 showed how the deserts of Palestine and Egypt were transformed, Basil’s work has a similar effect on the Cappadocian countryside. This is not simply an edifying tale as interpreted by Thélamon. Monastic retreat and Origenist bible study produce action in the ascetic which transforms the physical and spiritual landscape.

Rufinus continues the fertility metaphor in his description of Gregory’s work. Rather than a man of action like Basil, Gregory “longed only for the riches of wisdom” and achieved “much greater results in himself than Basil did in others.”¹³² Yet Gregory’s gifts were not solely inwardly focused. Whereas Basil consoled the sinner and helped to reconcile him, through his preaching Gregory, “by the gift if divine eloquence removed temptation to sin and did not allow those to fall who once injured could be made to stand again only with difficulty.”¹³³ Thus ideally Gregory’s work made Basil’s unnecessary because if they followed Gregory’s teaching, the faithful would never need to be restored through the active ministry of

¹³⁰ Rufinus, *EH* 11.9, PL 21: 518: “*Divina dispensatione ad imbuendos populos vocarentur . . .*”

¹³¹ Rufinus, *EH* 11.9, PL 21: 518: “*ita brevi permutata est totius provinciae facies . . .*”

¹³² Rufinus, *EH* 11.9, PL 21: 519.

¹³³ Rufinus, *EH* 11.9, PL 21: 519.

Basil. Both accomplished the same goal through different spiritual gifts; Rufinus tells us that a “different grace” (*diversa gratia*) was active in them to achieve “one work of perfection” (*unum opus perfectionis*).¹³⁴ The two “types” of ascetic vocation are integrally complementary of one another.

Yet they are not only ascetics, whose time of retreat empowers them for action; they are also bishops. Paralleling his two sections on Basil and Gregory’s divine commissioning, Rufinus provides two sections on their deeds as bishops. Carefully distinguishing his work as an ascetic from that as bishop, Rufinus tells us that Basil was “not long after” bishop of Cappadocia. There has been no mention up to point of his ordination as deacon or presbyter. The sole authority for his previous action was the grace of God given to him as a result of his monastic retreat and Scriptural studies. In his role as bishop Basil is again presented as the man of action, especially as Rufinus narrates his confrontation with the “Arian” emperor Valens. Rufinus conflates several different encounters between the emperor and Basil to show Basil’s power as an ascetic holy man and bishop.¹³⁵ Courageous in the face of threats to conform to the Emperor’s ecclesiastical policy, like the story of Alexander of Byzantium passed on by Athanasius, Rufinus has Basil ordered to comply with the emperor’s wish and given the night to consider his situation and conform. Rather than the death of the heretic, divine favor on Basil is shown by the sudden pain experienced by Valens’ wife and the death of the emperor’s son. Both events, according to Rufinus, “in retribution for their father’s impiety.”¹³⁶ Messengers from Valens arrive, beseeching Basil to intercede for the emperor and his wife, lest they should also perish. Whereas in certain versions of Basil’s encounter with Valens, Basil does indeed intervene and pray for his son’s health, this is not the case for Rufinus. Rather the messengers from the emperor serve to demonstrate the acknowledgement of Basil’s power

¹³⁴ Rufinus, *EH* 11.9, PL 21: 519: “*Sic in utroque diversa gratia unum opus perfectionis explebat.*”

¹³⁵ For a discussion of Basil’s interaction with Valens in the ecclesiastical and politic manuverings of his episcopal tenure, see Raymond Van Dam, “Emperors, Bishops, and Friends in Late Antique Cappadocia,” *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., 37 (1986), 53–76; Rousseau, *Basil*, 135–136 and 351–353.

¹³⁶ Rufinus, *EH* 11.9, PL 21: 519: “*extinctus paternaे impietatis creditur exsolvisse supplicia.*”

as a holy man by those deemed “heretical.” There is in addition an apologetic postscript supplied by Rufinus (who was never one to let an apologetic opportunity escape him). It was through the demonstration of his power and by confronting Valens that Basil escaped exile, not through any cooperation with the emperor or by compromising his theological beliefs.

Turning to Gregory, Rufinus similarly informs us of his advancement to the episcopacy, again without mentioning any previous clerical offices held. He tells us that he succeeded his father as bishop of Nazianzus. As with Basil, the portrait of Gregory as the divine teacher and preacher is as consistent with his actions as bishop as it was during his ascetic career. Having restored peace to Nazianzus, Gregory came to Constantinople to “instruct the church (*ad Ecclesiam docendam*).” Just as Basil in a short time recast the landscape of Cappadocia, so does Gregory

in a short time cure the people of the chronic illness of heresy . . . that it seemed to them that they were becoming Christians and seeing the new light of truth for the first time, now that the teacher of religion was instructing them

with words and examples.¹³⁷ Yet, in Rufinus’ account, along with Gregory’s great success came envy, and certain persons in Constantinople began to murmur that he should return to Nazianzus. Rather than allow dissension in the community, Gregory resigns his see and returns to Nazianzus. Rufinus includes no mention of the Council of Constantinople which was the backdrop to Gregory’s resignation; rather he presents the dissension as arising from within the community in response to the eloquence of his preaching and his success in reviving the church there.

Having provided examples of Gregory and Basil’s particular divine charisms, and how they fulfilled their missions in different ways as both bishops and ascetics, Rufinus provides a concluding paragraph. Introducing himself again into the narrative, he notes their extant sermons which he had translated into Latin.¹³⁸ He then informs us

¹³⁷ Rufinus, *EH* 11.9, PL 21: 520: “*Ubi brevi tempore tantum ad emendandum populum vetustis haereticorum infectum venenis proficit, ut tunc primum Christiani sibi fieri viderentur, et novellam lucem veritatis aspicere, cum religiosus doctor multa quidem verbis, plura tamen doceret exemplis.*”

¹³⁸ Rufinus’ translations are found in Migne, PG 31: 1723–1794. It is interesting to note that in his translation Rufinus provides eight sermons, not the ten he

of Basil's other brothers, Gregory and Peter. The significance of these two Cappadocians lies in their reflection of the archetypes presented by Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus. Gregory of Nyssa parallels his brother Basil, while Peter functions in the same manner as Nazianzus:

the first [Gregory of Nyssa] so rivaled his brother in doctrinal exposition and the second in works of faith, that either was simply another Basil or Gregory . . . But enough about them.¹³⁹

Rufinus' portrayal of Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil of Caesarea in 11.9 serves an important function. Rather than getting his facts wrong or merely presenting an edifying tale of two holy men, Rufinus is developing the place of monasticism and asceticism within the church following the passing of Athanasius. He does not so much distort the facts as completely divorce Gregory and Basil from their historical context and provide a different framework in which to interpret their work. There is no mention of the homoian creed of Constantius' last years, nor the fact that Basil and Gregory's primarily theological debate was their concerted response to counter the theological views of Aetius and Eunomius. There is likewise no mention of the Council of Constantinople nor of any of their contributions to the theological "settlement" of the "Arian" controversy. The two are the exemplars of the new monastic paradigm of authority in the church, a paradigm which Rufinus begins to develop immediately after the departure of Athanasius from the scene. Through their ascetic monastic study of Origen they are empowered by God along the lines of Rufinus' teacher Didymus and his own portrait of Origen. They are each empowered with a particular charism which enables them to transform the physical and spiritual landscape of their homelands in response to perceived threats of heresy. Loyalty to an authoritative school is here combined with a new paradigm of authority, that of the ascetic bishop. This new understanding of authority in the church is reflected in Rufinus' description of Gregory of Nyssa and Peter, whose significance lies in the fact that they repli-

mentions in the history. See his preface, edited in Simonetti, *Tyrannii Rufini Opera*, 237: "Octo ergo eius breues istos omelíticos transtuli libellos." See also Claudio Moreschini, *Filosofia e letteratura in Gregorio di Nazianzo, Platonismo e filosofia patristica. Studi e testi, Volume 12* (Milan: Vita e pensiero, 1997), 250–261.

¹³⁹ Rufinus, *EH* 11.9, PL 21: 520.

cate the authoritative models provided by the two great Cappadocians. Rufinus has taken the Eusebian model of writing history but demonstrates a significant paradigm shift in the locus of power. It is no longer only the authoritative teacher and the school of disciples emerging from him; it is lived out in an active life informed by ascetic discipline. The authoritative teacher is eliding into the episcopal holy man.

VII. CONCLUSION

Rufinus of Aquileia's revision and additions to Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* are an important element in the development of Nicene historiography. Writing from his own particular perspectives, Rufinus serves as a bridge in synthesizing the turbulent events of the fourth century into a form which we now understand as the "Arian" controversy. Rufinus shows himself both an inheritor of the paradigm of historiography which he received from Eusebius as well as a forger and breaker of new ground.

Rufinus operates in a Eusebian historiographic paradigm through his loyalty to both the school of Origen and the traditions of Athanasius. In his revisions and additions to Books 1–9, he follows the Eusebian pattern of writing history as an apologetic extension of loyalty to a theological tradition. His revisions to the *Ecclesiastical History* demonstrate his efforts to expunge controversial theological opinions. He also supplies additional edifying and apologetic details to the life of Origen. In a certain sense, his additional two books are an extension of this paradigm in constructing an apologetic defense of Athanasius and the nascent school of Nicene orthodoxy. In writing his apology of Athanasius and the Nicene school, he constructs important patterns of authority. Rufinus provides portraits of the proper actions of the "pious" emperor and the corresponding reliance of the "heretical" emperors on improper influences. Rufinus does this through misrepresentation and deliberate reorganization of historical events, such as taking great pains to place the exile of Athanasius in the reign of Constantius instead of Constantine. He likewise provides details not found elsewhere, either of his own invention or through one of his sources, such as the anonymous "Arian" presbyter who exercised considerable influence over both Constantine and Constantius.

At extension of this apologetic is his mythic portrayal of Athanasius. In contrast to the role of imperial authority in the church, Rufinus provides a hagiographic portrait of Athanasius as the divine holy man on whom God's favor rests. He gives us details of Athanasius' life not found elsewhere and constructs a narrative of his life which reflects the historical construct of "Arianism" which Athanasian sources created. The history of the fourth century becomes a struggle between Athanasius and a concerted group of "Arian" heretics. Rufinus places the genesis of this struggle at the Council of Nicaea itself, where he places Athanasius and provides him with a prominent role.

The portrait of Athanasius marks a shift in Rufinus' history, a move from the Eusebian paradigm to a new one. Central to the Eusebian paradigm was loyalty to the teacher and the theological school of which the author was a member. Such an understanding of historiography cuts across the artificial distinctions of "Arian" and "Nicene" and demonstrates that history provided a narrative of community identity to a wide variety of expressions of Christianity in the fourth century. In his *Ecclesiastical History*, Rufinus introduces a different paradigm of authority which will eventually supercede that of the Eusebian model.

In Book 11, with the death of Athanasius, Rufinus turns his attention to the rise of monasticism in the church. The monks are the new locus of power in the church; the war of the persecutors is waged against them rather than Athanasius. The consummate examples of this new pattern of authority are Gregory of Nazianzus and Basil of Caesarea. In an elaborately constructed portrayal of the two, Rufinus presents them as powerful holy men trained and disciplined by their years of monastic retreat and Origenist bible study. Future leaders are significant in that they reflect these paradigms established by Gregory and Basil.

Rufinus, though often overlooked, provides a crucial piece of Nicene historiography. His work reveals a complexity of construction and a dedicated sense of purpose. Thélamon has argued that Rufinus' work be primarily interpreted as reflecting the power of the divine operating in the church. I have noted both the accuracy of this assessment and its limitations. Rufinus is more than a hagiographer; he is the link between the diversity of expression in the fourth century and the monolithic understanding of later generations' understanding of the period as consumed by an "Arian" controversy. Rufinus was the first to write a Nicene history of the fourth century. This

is perhaps Rufinus' most important legacy. His work passed into later historians, and, though often critiqued, his structure, method, and narrative form the bulk of Socrates and Theodoret's treatment of the time period. Yet diversity in historical perception of the fourth century was not yet a thing of the past. An author writing a generation after Rufinus provides us with the most comprehensive assessment of the fourth century from a non-Nicene perspective. It is to that history that we now turn.

CHAPTER FIVE

OTHER VOICES, OTHER ROOMS: THE *ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY* OF PHILOSTORGIIUS

I. INTRODUCTION

Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa were not the only Cappadocians to have a significant role to play in the latter stages of the “Arian” controversy. Another native of Cappadocia, Philostorgius of Borissus, is the most important source for the development and history of the non-Nicene theological party of Eunomius and Aetius. Philostorgius composed a church history stretching from the dispute between Arius and Alexander to the attempted usurpation of Valentinian III during the reign of Theodosius II,¹ composed in twelve books. Fortunately, unlike the anonymous chronicler of the mid-fourth century, Philostorgius’ work is preserved. The great Byzantine scholar Photius provided a brief summary in his *Bibliotheca*,² and separately produced a much longer epitome.³ Fragments of Philostorgius’ work also appear in a number of historical and hagiographic works: for example the *Martyrdom of Artemius* by John of Rhodes,⁴ the *Vita Constantini*, and in several entries in Suidas’ *Lexicon*.⁵

Historiographic assessments of Philostorgius, needless to say, have been colored through the perspective of a Nicene interpretation of the fourth century. Philostorgius’ work has been routinely dismissed as hopelessly prejudiced and nearly historically worthless. In the words of Johannes Quasten, the history was “ostensibly a continuation of Eusebius but in reality a late apology for the extreme Arianism of Eunomius.”⁶ Such an interpretation fails to take into account the

¹ His history thus covered the period roughly from 318–420.

² Photius, *Bibliotheca* 40.

³ Edited by Bidez, *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte*, 1–150.

⁴ Critical text collected and edited by Bidez, *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte*, 151–157.

⁵ For a summary of the collection of fragments, see Bidez, XLIV–CII; see also Bidez, “Fragments nouveaux de Philostorge sur la vie de Constantin,” *Byzantion* 10 (1935), 403–442.

⁶ Johannes Quasten, *Patrology* (Vol. 3), 531.

fact that Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History* could equally be dismissed as a distorted hagiographic account of Rufinus' monastic heroes and of Athanasius' career. Centuries of privileging a Nicene perspective have obscured the fact that all of the ecclesiastical histories written in the fourth and fifth centuries, Nicene as well as non-Nicene, are apologetic documents with particular biases. This privileging of a Nicene perspective has resulted in limited discussion or analysis of Philostorgius as an historian. The diversity of the fourth century which has been revealed in recent Patristic studies has yet to be extended to Philostorgius and his church history. Historiographic assessments of Philostorgius seemed to have advanced little from Photius' comment that the work "is not so much a history as a panegyric of the heretics, and nothing but a barefaced attack on the orthodox" and that "the author is a liar and the narrative often fictitious."⁷ All authors writing in the fourth century could be considered liars by the standards Quasten puts forward. The question has been the privileging of one set of liars over another.

Alongside these pejorative interpretations, some authors, both ancient and modern, have been willing to acknowledge a certain worth to Philostorgius' work in spite of his prejudices. This helps to explain why Photius excerpted the work of a known "heretic" and why this epitome continued to be copied. Even Photius himself, while castigating Philostorgius for his Eunomian views, nonetheless acknowledges his "style is elegant, his diction often poetical, though not to such an extent as to be tedious or disagreeable."⁸ Gibbon in particular notes that Philostorgius' theological position provided him with access to a different variety of sources other than Nicene writers, concluding that "the heresy of Philostorgius appears to have given him superior means of information."⁹ It is the wealth and depth of historical events that Philostorgius treated which was the reason his history was widely excerpted in others' work, and that Photius produced an epitome in addition to the brief summary contained in the *Bibliotheca*. Indeed, in spite of the author's perspective, the epitome of Philostorgius' *Ecclesiastical History* continued to be copied throughout the medieval period.¹⁰ Despite his theological opin-

⁷ Photius, *Bibliotheca* 40; English translation in Quasten, 531.

⁸ Photius, *Bibliotheca* 40; translated in Quasten, 531.

⁹ Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Chapter 27.

¹⁰ The way in which Philostorgius deals with "secular" historical events sets him

ions, Philostorgius was too valuable a source for the time period covered to disappear.

Regardless of the unique perspective which Philostorgius offers as the only semi-extant source for a non-Nicene history of the fourth century, he has been almost completely ignored.¹¹ The only work to devote attention to Philostorgius' *Ecclesiastical History*, apart from critiquing it from a Nicene perspective, was Pierre Batiffol's brief monograph, *Quaestiones Philostorgianae*, which appeared over a century ago.¹² Batiffol demonstrates how Philostorgius viewed the current state of the Eunomian theological party from an apocalyptic perspective. As the persecuted, righteous minority, the Eunomians currently find hope in the historical events of the Theodosian period, which can only be seen as the beginning of the end times.¹³ Yet apart from this perspective, there has been little analysis of Philostorgius' work as a contribution to the history of the church during the formative fourth century. Bidez' introduction in his *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte* remains the most complete account of Philostorgius and his work. In stark contrast to Eusebius, Socrates, and Rufinus, no one has examined the way that Philostorgius writes his history. This is due to the assumption that his history is inherently flawed because he is

apart from Eusebius and other church historians. In his essay "Pagan and Christian Historiography in the Fourth Century AD," in *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1964), Arnaldo Momigliano notes, "The Christians invented ecclesiastical history and the biography of saints, but did not try to Christianize ordinary political history . . . No real Christian historiography founded upon the political experience of Herodotus, Thucydides, Livy, and Tacitus was transmitted to the Middle Ages (88–89)." With his apocalyptic/prophetic interpretation of history and attention devoted to "secular" events such as the deposition of Gallus (4.1, 5.4) and the last years of Theodosius' reign (11.2, 11.7), Philostorgius contained information about the fourth century not found in the other historians, and would appear to be an exception to Momigliano's assertion. Whether Momigliano's offhand comment that "no real Christian history" concerned itself with purely secular affairs indicates that he does not consider Philostorgius to be a Christian historian cannot be determined.

¹¹ See Chapter 1 for the absence of recent scholarship on Philostorgius.

¹² Pierre Batiffol, *Quaestiones Philostorgianae* (Paris: 1891). The most exhaustive work to treat the Aetian/Eunomian party, Thomas Kopecek's *A History of Neo-Arianism*, ignores Philostorgius almost completely, other than as an historical source for reconstructing the careers of Aetius and Eunomius. Likewise in his recent book Richard Vaggione also relies heavily on Philostorgius, but, like Kopecek, mainly as a source for the evolution of the Aetian/Eunomian school of thought.

¹³ See discussion of Batiffol's thesis in Bidez, CXIII–CXXI. Nobbs, while noting Philostorgius' apocalyptic bent ("An Alternative Ideology," 274), does not reference Batiffol's or Bidez' interpretations.

a “heretic.” While acknowledging his style and the historical facts which he preserves, scholarship has been reluctant to provide an analysis of Philostorgius’ as history. For Nobbs, Philostorgius’ purpose seems to be to identify issues facing the church. She notes that

From the ‘mirror image’ of emperors and heroic Christian leaders we can trace the polemic of the day . . . we need to consider the alternative view presented by Philostorgius and those of like mind. Only by doing so can we understand the real issues at stake.¹⁴

This denigration of Philostorgius as merely a mirror-image of the Nicene historians is repeated in Glenn Chesnut’s article on the legacy of Eusebius.¹⁵ Chesnut deals with Philostorgius in two sentences, noting that his work shows that church history was “a game which all sides could play . . .” and that “Far more important are the *Ecclesiastical Histories* of the fifth century . . .”¹⁶

This marginalization of Philostorgius’ work has been modified in recent years by Raymond Van Dam. Van Dam addresses Philostorgius as part of his larger project of examining the development, spread, and institutionalization of Christianity in Cappadocia. In his recent work *Becoming Christian: the Conversion of Roman Cappadocia*,¹⁷ Van Dam devotes significant attention to the role that remembering the past played in debates between Basil, the Gregories, and Eunomius. Calling into question the marginalization of “heretical” sources, Van Dam refers to Eunomius as a “Cappadocian father,”¹⁸ and takes seriously Philostorgius’ attempt to craft an alternative history:

To maintain his independence and reputation, Philostorgius had to get control of the past by composing his own history. Writing the past was essential to guaranteeing a future legacy for himself and his theology.¹⁹

Laudable as the work of Nobbs and Van Dam is in reassessing Philostorgius, I will attempt to take a broader and more holistic

¹⁴ Nobbs, 281.

¹⁵ Glenn Chesnut, “Eusebius, Augustine, Orosius, and the Later Patristic and Medieval Christian Historians,” *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, 687–713.

¹⁶ Chesnut, 688.

¹⁷ Raymond Van Dam, *Becoming Christian: the Conversion of Roman Cappadocia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003).

¹⁸ Van Dam, “Eunomius as Cappadocian Father,” 15–45.

¹⁹ Van Dam, 161.

view of Philostorgius' work. It must be taken into account with Nicene attempts to likewise construct narratives of community identity (Van Dam does not mention Rufinus once in his work), and must be seen as integral to Philostorgius' faith as a non-Nicene follower of Eunomius and Aetius.²⁰ This chapter will demonstrate that Philostorgius is as developed and detailed an historian as Rufinus in crafting a church history which reflects a particular theological interpretation of the search for the Christian doctrine of God in the fourth century. He is not a straw man to cast the accomplishments of Nicene historians into greater perspective, nor only concerned with his and his teachers' reputation for posterity.

While not directly responding to Rufinus, Philostorgius is doing much the same as his Nicene predecessor. Namely, Philostorgius professes to be writing a continuation of Eusebius' church history. Like Rufinus, he provides an introductory section giving his theological and historical reasons for continuing Eusebius.²¹ As Photius notes, Philostorgius begins his work with a description of the four books of the Maccabees, and is "loud in the praise of their unknown author," because these events in these books "correspond exactly with the prophecies of Daniel."²² Taken with Batiffol's work, this opening chapter reveals an important theological element to Philostorgius' writing. He begins with the Maccabees, who saw themselves as the righteous minority struggling against a corrupt political and ecclesiastical hierarchy, much like the current state of the outlawed Eunomian party in his own time. Further, he links the historical events of this persecuted minority with the apocalyptic prophecies of the Hebrew Scriptures. As Battifol has shown, Philostorgius likewise attempts to show how the historical events of the time period covered in his history are part of an apocalyptic framework.²³

After providing this theological hermeneutic by which he intends to interpret recent history, Philostorgius, like Rufinus, acknowledges his debt to Eusebius. Photius informs us that he "praises Eusebius

²⁰ Nobbs avoids the theological issues, focusing on Philostorgius as an "alternative" history. Van Dam's main focus is as a historian and scholar of social and community development in Cappadocia, and places the bulk of his emphasis on the struggles for predominance and prestige among the Cappadocians.

²¹ See Chapter 2, 18–19.

²² Philostorgius, 1.1; Bidez, 5.

²³ See Bidez, cxiii–cxxi.

Pamphilus” for his ecclesiastical history. Yet, as with his description of the books of the Maccabees, Philostorgius reveals a deeper purpose in this praise of Eusebius, a purpose integral to the work as a whole. Philostorgius’ praise of Eusebius is limited: he also criticizes him for his theological opinions. In particular Philostorgius faults Eusebius for asserting that God was unknowable and unattainable: “καὶ τὸ ἀμάρτημα ὁ δυσσεβῆς διηγούμενος διότι ἄγνωστον τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἀκατάληπτον ἥγοιτο.”²⁴ Philostorgius, as a devout Eunomian, could not countenance such an assertion. Both Eunomius and his teacher Aetius had asserted that God was indeed knowable in God’s essence. The proper way to know and approach God was through the attribute of “ungeneratedness”, ἀγέννητος. The conception that God can be known in this manner was put forward by Aetius in his *Syntagmation*²⁵ and developed by Eunomius in his *Apology* and *Apology for the Apology*,²⁶ and represents a key distinction between the various non-Nicene theological parties in the fourth century.²⁷ Philostorgius then notes that Eusebius concluded with the succession of Constantine by his sons before beginning his own history in 1.3 with the disputed episcopal election in Alexandria. As with his description of the Maccabees, his discussion of Eusebius, even through the interpretative prism of the Photian epitome, reveals a deeper purpose. Central to Philostorgius’ church history will be demonstrating his loyalty to the Lucianic traditions, with a particular emphasis on the purity of the Aetian/Eunomian doctrine of God as the standard for interpreting the theological parties of the fourth century. What was extant only in scattered fragments in the anonymous chronicler is presented in a fully developed and detailed counter to a Nicene interpretation of the fourth century. This concern for the theological lineage of the Lucianic school and preservation of doctrinal purity will be the central component of the bulk of his history. Thus while primarily known for his preservation of historical events, for Philostorgius, as with Eusebius,

²⁴ Philostorgius 1.2; Bidez, 6.

²⁵ The Greek text with English translation and commentary may be found in Lionel Wickham, “The Syntagmation of Aetius,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968), 532–569.

²⁶ For the critical texts of Eunomius’ work, see Richard Vaggione, *Eunomius: Extant Works*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

²⁷ See the extensive discussion of Aetius’ understanding of the nature of God, including the role of the word *agennetos*, in Kopecek, 232–266. For his discussion of Eunomius’ development of the term in his *Apology*, see Kopecek, 307–353.

Athanasius, the anonymous chronicler, and Rufinus, the primary concern was his community.

Two other significant elements of Philostorgius' *Ecclesiastical History* will be examined in this chapter. In the last chapter we saw how Rufinus' continuation of Eusebius was an important piece of formulating Nicene identity through appropriation of the past. In Philostorgius we will see much the same process taking place through a non-Nicene perspective. In particular I will show how Philostorgius provides a description of imperial authority in the church. Furthermore, I will demonstrate how he actively constructs portraits of Aetius and Eunomius as holy men as well as teachers, and from a fundamentally different construction of authority in the church from that found in Rufinus. While Rufinus represents a larger overall paradigm shift in understanding of authority in the church, Philostorgius represents the last gasp of tracing authority through succession in a particular school of thought, loyal to a founder.

In addition to outlining the distinct aspects of his history which are in contrast to the work of Rufinus, by examining how Philostorgius fits into the continuum of historiographic development we gain an insight into a question which has bedeviled scholars in recent decades: if one is to jettison the hermeneutic that “heresy” is somehow either intrinsically flawed or external to the church, then why did non-Nicene Christianity decline and “orthodoxy” flourish? Along with a variety of reasons outlined in recent works,²⁸ the development of historiography plays a crucial role in answering this question.

²⁸ As noted, for centuries the majority of reasons provided for the predominance of Nicene orthodoxy had to do with biases against heresy. For Gwatkin, “The crowning weakness of Arianism was the utter badness of its method (*Studies*, 17–21).” For Newman, Arianism was unduly influenced by the syncretist theology of its day, akin to the trends of liberalism within his contemporary Church of England. Likewise “Arianism” has been criticized as depending too much on either Judaism, Greek philosophy, or political patronage, depending on the perspective of the author. Hanson provides the most balanced recent assessment, noting that the development of Nicene orthodoxy was “not the story of embattled and persecuted orthodoxy maintaining a long and finally successful struggle against heresy (*Search*, 870).” Nor was Nicene orthodoxy the abandonment of Scriptural Christianity as a result of Hellenization: “Christianity, in order to achieve an understanding of itself has always been compelled to borrow, where and as it could, the materials on contemporary philosophy (*Search*, 871).” Rather for Hanson the fourth century can be seen as a process of trial and error in developing a doctrine of the Trinity after the abandonment of the old Logos theology. Vaggione’s has much the same perspective, realizing that the fourth century is emblematic of the development of doctrine.

II. BE TRUE TO YOUR SCHOOL, PART II: THE LUCIANIC TRADITIONS IN PHILOSTORGSIUS

As I have demonstrated above in Chapter 3, the anonymous chronicler of the fourth century emerged from Antiochian-Nicomedian Lucianic traditions. Integral to his (lost) church history was a description of the prominent members of this school and their pious acts. Apart from the great teacher, Lucian, the chronicler devoted particular attention to a succession of leaders of this school: the prominent bishops Eusebius of Nicomedia, Leontius of Antioch, and Euzoius, also bishop of Antioch. Philostorgius' work provides a more fully-developed theological and historical outline of the development of the Lucianic school. Philostorgius had greater historical perspective, writing roughly fifty years after the anonymous chronicler. He had witnessed the results of the proclamation of Cappadocian Neo-Nicene orthodoxy in the Council of Constantinople of 381 and the corresponding repressive anti-heretical legislation of Theodosius I and Theodosius II designed to stifle dissent of all kinds. As part of this legislation Philostorgius' own theological party was especially singled out, due to both political and theological reasons. Theologically, the "heterousios" doctrine of the Aetian/Eunomian party was one belief that was able to unite a variety of theological parties to rally around the twin pillars of homoousios and the Council of Nicaea. As Barnes and Kopecek have argued,²⁹ the years 359–362 saw a reconciliation between Athanasius and various parties which had been at odds in order to form a united front against what they deemed to be unacceptable opinions, largely that of the homoians and the heterousians. It was the perceived "radical" theology of the Eunomians which allowed them to be singled out in the Theodosian code as particularly odious heretics.³⁰ Historically, the Eunomians were also suspect

²⁹ For a description of Athanasius' attempt to forge a united front from former enemies against the homoians and Aetian/Eunomians, see Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 162–164. From a theological rather than historical perspective, Kopecek argues that the *De Synodis* is a concerted effort by Athanasius to win the homoiousion party to his side by showing the radical nature of the Aetian/Eunomian doctrine of heterousios; see Kopecek, 216–224. Kopecek in turn argues that the *Syntagmation*, Aetius' most developed and only extant theological work, was an attempt to explicate and defend his doctrine in light of the attention given to it in theological debate of the time.

³⁰ For the relevant legislation on the Eunomians, see the Codex Theodosius, 16.5.17, 23, 25, 27, 32, 36, 58–61. These laws deal specifically with the Eunomians.

because of their leader's perceived participation in the attempted usurpation of Procopius against Valens, as well as through earlier associations with the disgraced Caesar Gallus and Julian, the great enemy of the Christians.³¹ Eunomius had a particularly difficult time explaining his actions in regards to Procopius' abortive attempt to restore the house of Constantine to the throne. While fleeing from Valens' troops, Procopius took refuge for a time at one of Eunomius' estates. For their perceived or real roles in the revolt, Aetius was condemned to death (later commuted), and Eunomius was exiled. Thus not only were their theological opinions considered beyond the pale; their loyalty was likewise questioned through associations with disgraced a Caesar, an apostate emperor, and a usurper. The stakes are thus higher for Philostorgius than for the anonymous chronicler: he must provide a detailed exposition and defense of his theological tradition in his work, not only of the beginnings of the Lucianic school but for the current and beleaguered state of the Eunomian church.³²

They are also included in a rescript against the Manichees in 16.34, and in larger condemnations of heretics in 16.5.6, 8, 11–13, 65, and 16.6.7. Text and English translation with commentary in Clyde Pharr, *The Theodosian Code and Novels, and the Sirmondian Constitutions* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952).

³¹ For Philostorgius' account of Procopius' rebellion, see 9.5–9.8. For Socrates' description, without a mention of Eunomius' involvement, see 4.3–5; see also Sozomen, 6.8, and Kopecek's analysis, 425–430. Aetius was an intimate of the court of Gallus, and the Caesar had sent Aetius to discuss theological matters with his brother Julian (Philostorgius, 3.27). After his elevation to the purple, Julian wrote personally to Aetius, remitting his sentence of exile, and in addition invited him to court, authorizing the use of the *cursus publicus* for his journey (Julian, *Ep.* 15; for text and discussion see Kopecek, 415).

³² The place of the school of Lucian within the development of Aetius' and Eunomius' theology occupies an important place in Vaggione's work; see the relevant discussion in Vaggione, 45–47. For Vaggione, Lucian was seen as the expert (*peritus*) whose precision (*ἀκρίβεια*) in interpretation led to proper understanding of the Godhead. His followers were those who likewise were experts in interpretation, and who could accept no deviation from the precision of the teacher. Thus the use of proper language and terminology and the place of dialectic became an important part of the Lucianic school. While in general agreement with Vaggione, I am less interested in reconstructing the historical Aetius and Eunomius and more concerned with the principles and methods by which Philostorgius describes the Lucianic school, and how they fit into the overall larger plan of his work. Yet I will differ from Vaggione in examining the portrayal of Aetius and Eunomius as teachers. By examining Aetius and Eunomius from Philostorgius' perspective, we will see that they are more than "God-touched rhetors," experts skilled in dialectic. They are divinely empowered wonderworkers, through whom God's power flows as the result of the right belief. In addition, looking at Philostorgius' descriptions of Aetius and Eunomius

Philostorgius begins by doing much the same as the anonymous chronicler: highlighting the important role of the members of the school of Lucian in the development of the church up to and just after the Council of Nicaea. As part of this history, it is important to note the specific distance that he inserts between the Lucianic school and Arius. Arius, his opinions condemned and anathematized by Nicaea, does not figure prominently, historically or theologically, in the opening chapters of Philostorgius' work. Rather, Philostorgius has a different purpose in his treatment of Nicaea. He is seeking to discredit the events at the council. In Book 1, Philostorgius' main goal is to show how Alexander of Alexandria and Ossius of Cordoba collaborated to have the Nicene council promulgate the doctrine of homoousios, which is anathema to his own theological opinions. There is little mention of Arius or his teaching, though he is extolled as a teacher, a prominent presbyter of the church of Alexander, and the leading candidate for the bishopric of Alexandria.

Philostorgius begins by exonerating Arius and, perhaps taking a page from Rufinus, portrays an anonymous presbyter as the real source of dissent in Alexandria. He informs us that Arius and Alexander were both candidates for bishop after the death of Peter, and that Arius graciously withdrew his name and allowed Alexander to win the majority, and achieved a place of honor among the presbyters of Alexandria.³³ Far from preaching anything controversial or seeking conflict with his bishop, for Philostorgius it was a certain presbyter named Baucalis, second only to Arius,³⁴ who caused the dissension between Arius and Alexander. Baucalis designates a section of the city rather than a person's name, and most likely its usage by Philostorgius is meant to imply an unnamed presbyter who had jurisdiction over the church of Baucalis. It is from the envy of this presbyter that the subsequent dissension between Arius and Alexander began, and "the proclamation of homoousios was

in conjunction with other aspects of his history allows us to place his work in the larger development of church history, and lets us see him as standing in continuity with Rufinus rather than marginalized as "heretical."

³³ Philostorgius tells us that the votes were leaning in Arius' direction, but that he deferred to Alexander, giving him the victory: "τὰς ψήφους τῆς ὀρχιερωσύνης ἐπ' Ἀρειον φερομένας αὐτὸν μᾶλλον Ἀλέξανδρον προτιμήσαντα ἔαυτοῦ," Philostorgius 1.3.

³⁴ Philostorgius, 1.4: "δευτέρων τάξιν μετ' Ἀρειον."

invented.”³⁵ Far from the faith delivered by the fathers, homoousios for Philostorgius is an innovation; and not only an innovation, but one foisted onto the council by a well-organized and influential minority. Alexander travels to Nicomedia where he meets with Ossius and other bishops before the assembly of Nicaea to convince them to have the council proclaim the Son homoousios with the Father and anathematize Arius.³⁶

Arius himself figures very little in this account of the events leading up to the Council of Nicaea. After the council³⁷ Arius reappears in the narrative, and Philostorgius’ assessment is not entirely favorable. Philostorgius takes care to delineate the differences between the teachings of his own theological school and those of Arius, thus further demonstrating the variety in theological opinion which simple designations such as “Arian” or “Nicene” preclude. Philostorgius informs us that Arius was guilty of several mistaken opinions concerning the relationship between the Father and the Son. According to Philostorgius, Arius asserted that the Father “cannot be known, grasped, or reached by anyone”³⁸ not even by his only-begotten Son.³⁹ To Philostorgius this demonstrates that Arius was “carried away by absurdity (ἀτόποις ἐνέχεσθαι).” As noted above, for Philostorgius God the Father was knowable precisely through an accurate perception of his essence as ungenerated. Furthermore, not only is Arius mistaken in his theology of the Godhead, he is guilty of leading others astray with his opinions. Philostorgius tells us that a large number of his followers were led to these conclusions. Here he echoes the language he later uses to describe the actions of Eusebius the Great, Maris, and Theognis at Nicaea. In 2.15 he tells us these three were “led astray/συναπαχθῆναι” by the Council of Nicaea in professing homoousios. In 2.3 Philostorgius describes Arius’ followers as also being led astray (συναπενεχθῆναι) by their teacher. In contrast to these errors of Arius and his followers, Philostorgius explicitly

³⁵ Philostorgius 1.4: “καὶ τὴν τοῦ ὁμοουσίου ἀνακήρυξιν ἐκεῖθεν ἐπιτεχνασθῆναι.”

³⁶ Philostorgius, 1.7.

³⁷ Which I will treat in greater depth in the next section as part of a discussion of Philostorgius’ presentation of Constantine and imperial authority.

³⁸ Philostorgius, 2.3: “ἄγνωστόν τε τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἀκατάληπτον πανταχοῦ καὶ ἀνεννόητον.”

³⁹ “ἄλλα καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ μονογενεῖ νιῷ τοῦ θεοῦ.”

tells us that apart from “the disciples of the Martyr Lucian, namely, Leontius, Antonius, and Eusebius” the majority of believers followed Arius. Thus a critical distinction is being made between those who kept the theology of Lucian in its purest form as opposed to those who followed the teaching of Arius, who emerged from the same theological traditions but developed different ideas. Secundus and Theonas, though not of the school of Lucian, are likewise singled out for praise, due to the fact that they refused to subscribe to the doctrine of homoousios at Nicaea.

Eusebius becomes the leader of this group of persons opposed to the Nicene doctrine of homoousios, yet also upholding the teaching of Lucian as opposed to Arius. According to Photius’ interpretation of Philostorgius, “Nicomedia was the workshop where they contrived their evil deeds.”⁴⁰ Philostorgius provides the most extant detailed prosopography of the school of Lucian. In 2.13–2.15 Philostorgius gives an account of Lucian’s martyrdom. Philostorgius preserves the story of Lucian celebrating the eucharist on his breast while imprisoned in Nicomedia, also found in the *Vita* of Lucian preserved by Metaphrastes.⁴¹ He likewise gives the names of the disciples of Lucian. Eusebius, Maris, and Theognis appear first in the list. Leontius of Antioch, Antonius of Tarsus, Eudoxius, and Asterius the Cappadocian are also mentioned as prominent disciples, and each will have an important role in the unfolding of Philostorgius’ history. After mentioning these disciples, Philostorgius again ranks each according to how faithfully they kept the teaching of the master Lucian. Eusebius, Theognis, and Maris receive mixed reviews from Philostorgius as a result of their apostasy at Nicaea, and Antonius and Leontius are singled out as keeping the faith. Other disciples do not fare as well. Theognis is cited for believing that God was Father before he had begotten the Son, something which Aetius and Eunomius did not teach. Aetius and Eunomius eschewed using any Father/Son language to describe the two persons of the Trinity. They preferred the terms ungenerated/generated to designate the two. Further, terms Father and Son implied a relationship whereas they taught a dissimilarity in essence.⁴² God was only Father after he had begotten

⁴⁰ Philostorgius, 2.7; Walford translation, 437.

⁴¹ *Vita* of Lucian, para. 13–15, in Bidez, 195–196.

⁴² For a discussion of the theology of Aetius, see Hanson, *Search*, 603–611, and

the Son, which implied a commonality of will but not any sharing of essence between the two. As for Asterius, he likewise comes with a checkered record, given his record of sacrifice during the persecution.⁴³ Yet Philostorgius does not castigate him for this action, as do Nicene authors such as Athanasius and Epiphanius.⁴⁴ Rather Asterius warrants criticism from Philostorgius solely on his theological opinions. Asterius was a well-known supporter of Arius in the years following the council of Nicaea. He composed several works which he read in public, travelling to various churches, and was present at Antioch in 341 when the Dedication Creed was composed.⁴⁵ According to Philostorgius, Asterius, like Arius, departed from the proper Lucianic faith. Asterius “changed his mind”⁴⁶ and “affirmed in his words and by his writings that the Son was the unchangeable image of the Father’s substance.”⁴⁷ Like the teachings of Arius, this was unacceptable to Philostorgius: calling the Son the unchangeable image of the Father’s ousia implied a sharing of substance in some fashion between the Father and the Son. This very phrase attributed to Asterius’ “changing his mind,” ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας, appears in the Dedication Creed of 341. The source of this phrase in the Dedication Creed is one that was debated in ancient as well as modern historical circles. Sozomen indicates that

Kopecek, 197–199 and 226–297. See also Markus Vinzent, *Asterius von Kappadokien: die theologischen Fragmente* (New York: Leiden, 1993), especially 9–32, and Wolfram Kinzig, *In search of Asterius: Studies on the Authorship of the Homilies of the Psalms* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1990). The terms Father and Son would be increasingly problematic for Eunomius, who expanded on Aetius’ theology to teach that names denoted essences; therefore the only proper names for the first two persons of the Trinity were genetos/agennetos. See Hanson, 617–636, particularly 630–31.

⁴³ See Philostorgius’ reference to Asterius’ sacrifice in 2.14, “οὓς καὶ ἐλληνίσσαι φησίν ἐνδόντας τῇ τῶν τυράννων βίᾳ . . .” For a discussion of Asterius, see Bardy, *Recherches*, 317–328, and Hanson, *Search*, 32.

⁴⁴ Athanasius deals with Asterius in *De Synodis* 18, where he makes much of Asterius’ sacrifice during the persecution. Though barred from ordination because of his actions, according to Athanasius he nonetheless seated himself with the clergy and taught publicly in church, actions which were not appropriate given his lay status. Epiphanius mentions Asterius in *Panarion* 76. Socrates discusses Asterius in 1.36, essentially following Athanasius.

⁴⁵ For a discussion of Asterius’ theology, see Kopecek, 28–34, and Hanson, 33–41. The fragments of his works are collected in Bardy, 341–354.

⁴⁶ Literally, from “παρατρέψαι τὸ φρόνμα”; Philostorgius, 2.15.

⁴⁷ Philostorgius 2.15: “ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τὸν Ἀστέριον παρατρέψαι τὸ φρόνμα, ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας εἶναι τὸν νιὸν ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ λόγοις καὶ γράμμασι διαμαρτυρόμενον.”

Lucian was the source of this Creed, as do two other scattered references.⁴⁸ The other ancient historians, however, fail to mention the Lucianic reference. Hanson's assessment mirrors general scholarly consensus that Lucianic authorship cannot be proved with certainty, given that there are other elements in the Dedication Creed which would be unacceptable to both Lucian and Arius.⁴⁹ The witness of Philostorgius would seem to argue for an origin emerging from Asterius the sophist, whom he charges with this exact innovation (to him) in doctrine, in an attempt to defend the doctrinal purity of the great teacher.

As in the anonymous chronicler, we have a description of a school of thought stemming from Lucian the martyr taking a prominent place in the church. There are similarities between the two historians' work. Both preserve distinct references to the martyr Lucian.⁵⁰ Both acknowledge Eusebius "the Great" as the leader of the group of disciples who have a strong presence in Nicomedia, where Lucian was held for several years before being martyred, and in Antioch, where he taught before being arrested. Yet with Philostorgius there is a fully developed apologetic operating alongside this prosopography of the Lucianic school. His primary purpose in discussing the disciples of Lucian is to categorize them according to their fidelity to the teacher's doctrine. He mentions and evaluates their actions, such as Eusebius' apostasy at Nicaea and Asterius' sacrifice during the persecution, but these are secondary to the doctrines which they hold. In doing so Philostorgius drives a wedge between Nicene attempts to lump all opponents of Nicaea as "Arians." Philostorgius draws a distinct division between the theologies which Asterius and Arius develop and those that Eusebius, Antonius, and Leontius hold. While not disputing that they are disciples of Lucian, for Philostorgius they have clearly departed from proper doctrine.

⁴⁸ The *Martyrdom of Artemius*, PG 96: 320, and the Pseudo-Athanasian *Dialogue on the Trinity* (PG 28: 1204).

⁴⁹ Hanson notes in particular the term "became man," which would seem incongruous with a Lucianic doctrine of Christ taking a body without a soul. Hanson argues that the first Creed, which only said "took flesh" would be more consonant with an Arian and Lucianic interpretation. See Hanson, *Search*, 289–290. Vaggione, 66–67, ascribes the phrase in the Creed to Asterius the Sophist.

⁵⁰ As noted in Chapter 3, the anonymous chronicler preserves the only known fragment from a letter of Lucian. Similarly, Philostorgius preserves details not found in other contemporary sources, mainly details surrounding Lucian's martyrdom and his circle of disciples.

III. THE ANONYMOUS PRESBYTER REVISITED: PHILOSTORGIIUS' CONSTRUCTION OF IMPERIAL AUTHORITY

As with Rufinus and Eusebius, the portrayal of Constantine and involvement of his sons (particularly Constantius II) in ecclesiastical politics are important pieces of Philostorgius' history. Philostorgius provides a fresh perspective of the piety of Constantine and Constantius in regards to the various theological parties in the church and the historical development of the "Arian" controversy. Philostorgius' main goal is not unlike that of Rufinus. Whereas Rufinus sought to enshrine the Athanasian fantasy that a concerted group of devout followers of Arius conspired to undo the Nicene Council, Philostorgius seeks to establish an equally fanciful historical reality by demonstrating that a small cadre of influential bishops forced the term homoousios on the church, and that Constantine and his pious son Constantius sought to undo this injustice.

At Nicaea Philostorgius notes that Secundus and Theonas did not subscribe to the Creed and were banished. Others, such as Eusebius of Nicomedia, secretly said homoiousios rather than homoousios. Nonetheless they subscribed to the Creed and other decrees of the Council, including the deposition of Arius. At this point in Philostorgius' narrative Constantine becomes involved in the affairs of the church; unlike the portrayal in Eusebius or even Rufinus, there is no discussion of the piety of the emperor or of any prior involvement in the management of the church.⁵¹ In 1.5–6 Philostorgius wrote of how Constantine succeeded his father in Britain and of his conversion before the battle of the Milvian Bridge. But he is silent concerning Constantine's letters to Alexander and Arius quoted by Eusebius, and likewise does not mention the emperor in connection with the calling or conduct of the Council of Nicaea. It is only after the Council that Constantine takes action in regards to the ecclesiastical situation, to heighten Philostorgius' assertion that it was Alexander and Ossius, not the emperor, who were behind the injustices of Nicaea.

⁵¹ Recall that Eusebius of Caesarea preserved a number of historical documents outlining Constantine's religious policy prior to Nicaea, from the Edict of Milan to intervention in North Africa against the Donatists. See Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 10:5–7. Eusebius also includes Constantine's attempts to mediate the disputes in Alexandria as recounted in the *Life of Constantine*, 2.61–73 and 3.4, including a copy of his letter to Alexander and Arius in 2.64–72.

Reading between the lines of Photius' epitome, it would appear that Philostorgius informs us that Eusebius the Great and his followers,⁵² since they had subscribed to Nicaea, were punished for returning to their prior beliefs. Most notably Eusebius himself was exiled. In contrast to these actions, Philostorgius also informs us that Constantine was conciliatory towards Secundus of Ptolemais, who had not subscribed, whom he recalled from exile. Furthermore, rather than seeking to find a common ground between various parties or staunchly upholding the decrees of Nicaea, rather Philostorgius does just the opposite in his presentation of the house of Constantine. He presents Constantine as openly averring the doctrine of heterousios. He informs us that Constantine recalled Secundus and sent letters everywhere announcing this and “tore to pieces homoousios and supported heterousios.”⁵³ Bishop Alexander subscribed to these letters of Constantine and communed with Arius, only later to reject Arius once again. It was only in response to this second excommunication by Alexander that Arius and his followers separated themselves from the church. Thus when Constantine does take an interest in the affairs of the church in Philostorgius' history, he openly renounces Nicaea and advocates dissimilarity of essences rather than consubstantiality. As with Rufinus, Philostorgius paints a portrait of the emperor in conformity with his own piety.

In addition Philostorgius also deals with the events surrounding Constantine's death in a manner which places his own cause and interests in a favorable light. He first informs us in 2.4 that Constantine was poisoned by his brothers in retaliation for the execution of his son Crispus. Philostorgius repeats this assertion in 2.16 in his account of the death of Constantine. Philostorgius tells us that Constantine discovered the plot against him after he had been poisoned but before he died, and contrived to use his will as a way to exact revenge on his enemies. Constantine drew up a will in which he charged whichever of his sons arrived first to execute all persons involved in the plot against him, and entrusted his will to Eusebius of Nicomedia. Philostorgius has managed to accomplish two goals in his account of the death of Constantine: he has taken a story

⁵² Philostorgius 2.1: “τῶν περὶ τὸν Εὐσέβιον,” the same expression used by Athanasius.

⁵³ Philostorgius 2.1: “τὸ μὲν ὁμοούσιον διατύροντα, κρατύνοντα δὲ τὸ ἑτεροούσιον.”

which originated with Rufinus as a way to explain away embarrassing details of Constantine's concessions to "Arianism"—i.e., that he had been deceived by an anonymous presbyter—and turned it into an apology for his theological party. Rather than an anonymous presbyter, Philostorgius has Eusebius of Nicomedia, the great disciple and most prominent member of the Lucianic school, entrusted with the will. In addition to this narrative concerning Constantine's will, he restores the suppressed narrative that left out the "Arian" baptizer of the emperor. Apart from countering the portrait of Constantine in Rufinus, for Philostorgius Constantine's will also contained an exoneration for the murderous actions of Constantius which many contemporaries found distasteful. Rather than eliminating any potential rivals in a bloody palace coup, Constantius' slaughter of his father's extended family is instead portrayed by Philostorgius as the righteous vengeance of a son, following his father's instructions and taking action against the murderers.

Concerning the relationship between Constantine and Athanasius, Philostorgius likewise has a particular theological axe to grind. He charges that Athanasius was ordained bishop before a common consensus was reached by the convocation of bishops, a charge which Sozomen also notes and subsequently refutes.⁵⁴ Philostorgius then tells us that Athanasius falsely informed Constantine that he had been elected by a majority of the bishops; this deception resulted in Constantine confirming the election. Regarding the relationship between Athanasius and Constantine in the latter's deposition, Philostorgius preserves this far more faithfully than Rufinus, largely because it presents a more unsavory portrait of Athanasius, which suits his purposes. Unlike Rufinus, Philostorgius preserves the double deposition of Athanasius, first at Tyre and later confirmed at the Council of Jerusalem, both under the reign of Constantine. Philostorgius reproduces a number of charges leveled against Athanasius at Tyre: that his henchmen had committed sacrilege in overturning the altar and smashing the chalice of the presbyter Isychras; that he had

⁵⁴ Philostorgius, 2.11. According to Philostorgius, Athanasius cajoled two bishops into ordaining him against their will in the church of Dionysius. Sozomen tells us (2.17) that when a majority could not be reached, seven bishops went with Athanasius to the Church of Dionysius and ordained him bishop. Athanasius gives his own version of events in his *Apology Against the Arians* 6. See discussion in Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 18.

severed the hand of Armenius for use in magical ceremonies; and that he had wrongfully imprisoned the Melitian bishop Callinicus.⁵⁵ Philostorgius informs us that Athanasius' deposition was confirmed by the Jerusalem council, who elected Gregory the Cappadocian as bishop of Alexandria. However there is one point on which Rufinus and Philostorgius are in agreement: both consciously exclude any role for Constantine in Athanasius' deposition. Deliberately falsifying his chronology, Rufinus places the exile of Athanasius during the reign of Constantius, as we have seen. In his account, Philostorgius' emphasis is that Athanasius was deposed by two councils of fellow bishops. Therefore he leaves out any mention of Athanasius' flight to Constantinople and tumultuous interview with the emperor which was in truth the cause of his banishment. For Philostorgius theological concerns are paramount; therefore his last word on Athanasius is that he was deposed by a council of bishops and replaced by a someone with proper beliefs, Gregory of Cappadocia.

Philostorgius provides a more detailed description of the piety of Constantius than of Constantine. Unfortunately the exact words of his first description of Constantius in 3.2 are lost to Photian epitome. Photius tells us that Philostorgius praised Constantius: “Κωνστάντιον δι’ ἐπαίνων ὄγει.”⁵⁶ The remainder of the chapter consists of a list of Constantius' pious deeds. He built the church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, and transferred the relics of Andrew and Timothy to the church of the Holy Apostles. As noted in Chapter 3, this information is likewise present in the *Chronicon Paschale*.⁵⁷ Here Philostorgius specifically notes that Constantius erected a tomb in honor of his father in the Church of the Holy Apostles. Like the *Chronicon Paschale*, Constantius is being portrayed as paying proper respect to his father, and through a program of building churches and transferring relics of prominent martyrs is both imitating his father and demonstrating his own piety and devotion in his patronage to the church.

The text of the anonymous chronicler, as it can be reconstructed, portrays Constantius in a positive manner but makes no specific comments regarding his theological views. Yet unlike the portrayal in the *Chronicon Paschale*, Philostorgius' positive assessment of the emperor

⁵⁵ See discussion in Barnes, 20–33.

⁵⁶ Philostorgius, 3.2.

⁵⁷ See discussion in Chapter 3, 77–78.

is combined with the presentation of Constantius as an emperor opposed to Athanasius and increasingly sympathetic to the theological opinions of Aetius and Eunomius. Philostorgius informs us that Constantius expelled Athanasius from his see after he returned there following Constantine's death, and in addition "issued an order appointing George of Cappadocia" as bishop.⁵⁸ As a result of Constantius' attitude towards him, Athanasius fled to the court of his brother Constans, now sole emperor in the West after the defeat of Constantine II.

Contrary to Rufinus, Philostorgius also portrays Constantius as taking an interest in the spread of Christianity throughout the ancient world, furthering his portrayal of him as a pious emperor concerned with the expansion of the faith. As noted above, Rufinus falsely attributed the mission of Frumentius to the reign of Constantine rather than Constantius, to further his depiction of the pious Constantine to the detriment of his son.⁵⁹ In 3.4 Philostorgius presents a non-Nicene counter to Rufinus' version of the spread of Christianity. He tells the story of Constantius' embassy to Saba in an attempt to convert them from their Jewish customs to "the true religion."⁶⁰ Constantius takes an active role in determining the focus of this mission, asking for permission to build churches for the Christians in Saba. To head the embassy, Constantius appoints Theophilus "the Indian." Theophilus is a great hero for Philostorgius: a wonderworker, healer, ascetic, and later bishop in the separate hierarchy Aetius and Eunomius establish.⁶¹ Philostorgius tells us that Theophilus lived a life of blameless virtue, chose to live a monastic lifestyle, and was ordained deacon by Eusebius of Nicomedia.⁶² After being appointed to the embassy to Saba, he was ordained to the episcopacy, we are told, "by those of the same opinion."⁶³ Through the miracles he performs Theophilus

⁵⁸ Philostorgius, 3.3: "ἀντιχειροτονηθῆναι δὲ γνώμην ἀποφαίνει Γεώργιον τὸν ἐκ Καππαδοκίας."

⁵⁹ See Rufinus, 1.10, and Chapter 4.

⁶⁰ Philostorgius, 3.4: "ἐπὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν σκοπὸν."

⁶¹ For a discussion of the establishment of what he calls the "Neo-Arian" church, see Kopecik, 416–423; see also Hanson, 603. Theophilus' status as non-Nicene holy man will be discussed in greater depth in section IV below. See also the discussion of Theophilus in Vaggione, 193, and his place in the establishment of a separate hierarchy, 197–199.

⁶² Philostorgius, 3.4.

⁶³ "παρὰ τῶν ὄμοδόζων."

overcomes the machinations of the Jews at court and manages to convert the prince. The prince builds churches not out of the money provided by Constantius, but out of his own funds, “to show his own zeal was a match for the wonders performed by Theophilus.”⁶⁴ Philostorgius then relates that one of the churches built as a result of the mission of Theophilus still stands.

What we have in Philostorgius is a direct counter to the excursus in Rufinus 10.9–10. Philostorgius details a non-Nicene mission to Saba which succeeds. Contrary to the mission from Athanasius under Frumentius, Philostorgius demonstrates Constantius’ concern and direct involvement in the spread of religion and his choice of a prominent disciple of Eusebius of Nicomedia as the head of this mission. Like Frumentius, Theophilus is ordained bishop before his departure by a circle of supporters. We know that the Athanasian mission to Axum left a poor taste in the mouths of many. Athanasius himself provides evidence to this effect. In his *Defense before Constantius* Athanasius preserves a letter from Constantius to the princes of Axum, warning them about Athanasius. In the letter Constantius expresses the responsibility commissioned to him as emperor that Christianity be spread throughout the world: “It is altogether a matter of greatest care and concern to us, to extend the knowledge of the supreme God.”⁶⁵ Taking care to make sure there are no differences in belief,⁶⁶ he orders them to return Frumentius so that he may be examined by George of Cappadocia to make sure that his doctrine is sound.⁶⁷ Thus even Athanasius preserves evidence that there were some in the church hesitant about a mission spearheaded by a bishop known for questionable administration of his see. The truth about the spread of Christianity to these regions is impossible to reconstruct. What does remain fully intact, however, are the attempts to mould the image of the emperor to reflect particular concerns emerging from a clearly identifiable theological circle, and to provide support for the vibrancy of that form of Christianity, Nicene

⁶⁴ Walford translation, Philostorgius 3.4: “καὶ τῷ θαύματι τῶν Θεοφίλου ἔργων ἐνάμιλλον παρέχειν ἐφιλοτιμεῖτο τὸ πρόθυμον.”

⁶⁵ *Apologia ad Constantium*, 31. Translation from NPNF 2:4, 250. See brief discussion in Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 120.

⁶⁶ “we command that the same doctrine be professed in your churches [Axum] as in theirs [Romans].” *Apologia*, 31; NPNF 2:4, 251.

⁶⁷ Needless to say, this fact is suppressed in Rufinus’ account of Frumentius’ mission.

or non-Nicene. From this perspective, whether the mission to Saba occurred or not is not necessarily the point. What is significant is that the story of Theophilus' mission as found in Philostorgius serves to demonstrate the piety of Constantius and the attractive viability of non-Nicene Christianity. Thus Philostorgius is again taking a page from Rufinus: missionary successes reflect both on the dynamic power of the true faith as well as the piety of the sovereign.⁶⁸

A charge leveled against “Arianism” by historians was that it succeeded only because it had substantial imperial support, not through any popular appeal.⁶⁹ The short-lived successes of non-Nicene theology, the argument runs, would not have been possible without the patronage of Constantius, or for Aetius and Eunomius that of Gallus Caesar. Constantius in particular, as described by Rufinus and subsequent historians, was led astray by his episcopal advisors to support the “Arian” party. As part of his portrait of Constantius, Philostorgius presents a different perspective on imperial involvement in the affairs of the church. Rather it is Athanasius who is an opportunist and manipulator and reaps the benefits of imperial support. He describes an Athanasius who manages to cajole Constans into supporting him. After his exile to the West, Philostorgius tells us that Athanasius bribed important court officials, including the chamberlain Eustathius, in order to arrange a meeting with Constans.⁷⁰ This meeting resulted in a letter from Constans threatening war with Constantius unless Athanasius was allowed to return to Alexandria. Rufinus tells a different version of the encounter. Rufinus has Constans interview Athanasius directly and investigate his situation personally. Rufinus does not provide a direct quotation, but in his paraphrase of the letter, Constans threatens not only to invade Constantius’ kingdom, but to punish Athanasius’ enemies personally.⁷¹

⁶⁸ In her discussion of the mission to Axum, Thélamon almost completely ignores the parallel mission to India in Philostorgius. She only mentions the non-Nicene mission in order to demonstrate common missionary practice between Frumentius and Theophilus, i.e., conversion of the ruling prince leading to a broader acceptance of Christianity. See Thélamon, *Paiens et chrétiens*, 73.

⁶⁹ See Gwatkin, *Studies*, 115.

⁷⁰ Philostorgius, 3.12: “καὶ δώρων τοὺς αὐτῷ παραδυναστεύοντας ὑπαγαγὼν ἀφθονία.”

⁷¹ Rufinus, 10.20: “hunc itaque recte faceret si absque ulla molestia loco suo restitueret; si id nollet, sibi curae futurum, ut ipse id impleret regni eius intima penetrans et poenas dignissimas de auctoribus sceleris summens.”

Socrates provides a direct quotation from the letter. In his version Constans writes, “But if you were to refuse to take this action [allow the return of Athanasius and Paul of Constantinople], be assured that I will come in person and restore them to the thrones which are theirs, even against your will.”⁷² The main difference between Socrates’ account and that of Philostorgius and Rufinus is that he includes Paul of Constantinople in the request. Theodoret’s account is similar to Philostorgius and Rufinus: he paraphrases a letter in which Constans threatens to intervene personally to place Athanasius on his throne, as well as punish his enemies, with no mention of Paul of Constantinople. Theodoret even supplies the name of the military commander entrusted with the letter.⁷³ Scholarly consensus has been mixed as to the authenticity of this letter. Hanson argues against its authenticity, questioning whether Constans would be foolhardy enough to risk war over ecclesiastical matters. However the arguments of Simonetti and Barnes seem more plausible. They argue for the letter’s authenticity, noting that every single historian from the period mentions the incident and the letter.⁷⁴ In fact, this is one incident in which Philostorgius and Rufinus are in general agreement: both inform us that Constans intervened on behalf of Athanasius.

The relationship between Constans and Athanasius is an important one; the evidence from the period suggests that the only reason Constantius allowed Athanasius to return was this threat from his brother.⁷⁵ Furthermore, Athanasius himself would later be charged with treason at Sirmium for fostering discord between the two emperors.⁷⁶ Rufinus uses this incident as another way in which to portray the proper actions of the pious emperor: Constans receives Athanasius, speaks with him personally, and promises to restore him and punish his enemies. Having already told us of his irregular election, and how he deceived Constantine into thinking that he was elected by a majority of the people, Philostorgius further develops his theme of

⁷² Socrates, 2.22.

⁷³ Theodoret, 2.8.53–55.

⁷⁴ See Simonetti, *La Crisi Ariana nel Quarto Secolo* (Rome: Institutum Augustinianum, 1975), 189–201, and Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 63, 89–91.

⁷⁵ Lucifer of Caralis (*De Athanasio* 1.29) informs us that Constantius’ only reason for allowing the return of Athanasius was to prevent war with his brother. See Barnes, 63, and footnote 1, 257.

⁷⁶ Barnes, 63.

Athanasius as manipulator of imperial favor in his discussion of the intervention of Constans. It is through bribes to important imperial officials that Athanasius was able to win the support of Constans. For Philostorgius Athanasius uses his journey back to Alexandria as a way in which to convince various bishops to come over to “the homoousian” position.⁷⁷ Even Maximus, a prominent martyr who had lost an eye during the persecution, was led astray by Athanasius.⁷⁸ Thus the tables are turned: in Philostorgius’ account it is Athanasius, the advocate of Nicaea and the theology of Alexander, who uses bribes and connections to mislead imperial authority to his advantage.

Philostorgius also includes several other elements in Constantius’ reign which mark him as a pious and successful emperor, in contrast to the increasingly embittered Nicene portrait. Drawing parallels to his father’s victory of Maxentius, Philostorgius includes Constantius’ vision of the Cross before his battle with Magnentius.⁷⁹ Likewise Gallus, his Caesar appointed in the East and who invited Aetius to court, had success in his campaigns against the Persians.⁸⁰ Further, Constantius, fearing for his wife’s health, recalled Theophilus the Indian him from exile, begging him to heal his wife, which he did.⁸¹

Philostorgius’ portrait of Constantius culminates in the events just prior to and including his death. Having once had divine favor in his victories, such as the one over Magnentius as described in 3.26, Philostorgius informs us that later in his reign Constantius lost that favor. The reason for this was his banishment of the leaders of the Aetian/Eunomian party and his support of the homoian rather than heterousian party. Philostorgius tells us that Constantius “had been in the habit of gaining victories over his enemies,” but “after he had been seduced by the slanders of Basil [of Ancyra]” and banished Aetius and Theophilus the Indian,⁸² he was forced to retreat in battle against the Persians. Yet Philostorgius tells us that Constantius

⁷⁷ Philostorgius, 3.12: “πρὸς τὸ ὁμοούσιον.”

⁷⁸ “ἄλλὰ καὶ Μάξιμον τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ἐπίσκοπον πρὸς τὴν Ἀθανασίου δόξαν ἀποκλίνων.” Walford translates Maximus’ actions as “inclining” towards Athanasius’ opinions. I have chosen the pejorative use of ἀποκλίνω, to fall or be led astray, given that Philostorgius draws a contrast between Maximus’ honorable status as a martyr and his defection to the side of Athanasius, as well as his use of similar language in regard to those “led astray” by Nicaea.

⁷⁹ Philostorgius, 3.26.

⁸⁰ Philostorgius, 3.28.

⁸¹ Philostorgius, 4.7.

⁸² Philostorgius, 5.4: “διαβολαῖς ἀναπεισθεὶς Βασιλείου.”

made one last attempt to set matters straight before his death. In the opening chapters of Book 6 Philostorgius relates the deposition of Eunomius from the see of Cyzicus. According to Philostorgius, Acacius of Caesarea brought charges against Eunomius, causing Constantius to summon a council in Antioch to adjudicate them. At the council Acacius refused to come forward and press his charges, resulting in Constantius viewing the entire matter with suspicion, and deciding to “think over” the proceedings.⁸³

At this point the rebellion of Julian broke out. Having begun to doubt the intentions and motives of Acacius of Caesarea and his party, and reconsidering the case of Eunomius, and seeking to restore the divine favor which he had lost, Philostorgius then tells us that Constantius made a momentous decision. He called for a council to be assembled. The purpose of this council would be “to examine the heterousios” position in the church, and it was to be held in Nicaea.⁸⁴ Philostorgius, for whom the Council of Nicaea and its promulgation of the homoousios doctrine had been a great scandal, tells us that the last act of Constantius was to summon a council in the same city to investigate the doctrine of heteroousios.⁸⁵ The injustice of Nicaea would be at last be undone, by the son of Constantine, in the same city where homoousios had been promulgated years before. However on his journey to meet Julian he fell ill, was baptized by Euzoius of Antioch, and died.

Philostorgius’ portrayal of Constantius is the most important element in his presentation of imperial authority. Nonetheless, like Rufinus, his portrayal of subsequent rulers provides a larger picture of his attitude towards “good” and “bad” emperors. In regards to Julian, Philostorgius is largely in agreement with other writers in recounting the persecutions under his reign. He speaks of the desecration of the grave of John the Baptist⁸⁶ and of Babylas the

⁸³ Philostorgius, 6.5: “ταῦτα δὲ Κωνσταντίῳ διανοούμενῳ.”

⁸⁴ Philostorgius, 6.5: “καὶ σύνοδον ἅμα διώριζεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐτεροουσίου κατὰ Νίκαιαν ἵστασθαι.”

⁸⁵ Nicaea itself had taken on powerful symbolism. The Dated Creed was revised and accepted by Western bishops at the city of Nike, and the fact that Nike and Nicaea sound very much alike in Greek (Νίκη/Νίκαια), confused several bishops into thinking that this was the Nicene Creed. See Barnes, 146–147; Hanson, 379; Socrates, 2.37; and Sozomen, 4.19.

⁸⁶ Philostorgius, 7.4; see parallels in Rufinus, 11.28; Theodoret, 3.7; Sozomen, 5.20; and *CP* 546, 12.

Martyr,⁸⁷ as well as the attempts to rebuild the Jerusalem temple.⁸⁸ The main piece of Philostorgius' description of Julian's reign concerns the revocation of Constantius' sentences of exile. This revocation allows Eunomius and Aetius to return to Constantinople.⁸⁹ Regardless of the Julian's motives in issuing this decree, this event is an important one in the development of both Nicene and non-Nicene theology. For the Niceses, it allowed Athanasius to return to Alexandria and convene the important council of 362 which allowed for a broader coalition against the homoians and Aetian/Eunomians to be formed.⁹⁰ The non-Niceses likewise benefited from this freedom of movement and assembly that Julian's reign allowed.

Philostorgius informs us that the reason for Julian's edict was to bring Christians into open conflict with one another, thus damaging their reputation among the larger populace.⁹¹ Yet the practical result is that the reign of Julian allowed the Aetian/Eunomian party to organize itself after the banishment of Aetius and the resignation of Eunomius from his see of Cyzicus.⁹² In Philostorgius we find both men in Constantinople during Julian's reign, joined by supporters from Libya. They take this opportunity to ordain Aetius to the episcopacy, and in turn to ordain other bishops as well. This is the beginning of the formal break from the imperial church and the establishment of a separate religious entity, devoted to purity in belief and the doctrines of Aetius and Eunomius.⁹³ Thus while in general

⁸⁷ For parallel accounts of the story of Babylas, see Rufinus, 10.36; Socrates, 3.18; Sozomen, 5.19; and Theodoret, 3.10.

⁸⁸ Rufinus, 10.38–40; Socrates, 3.20; Sozomen, 5.22; Theodoret, 3.22. Ammianus Marcellinus also mentions Julian's plan to rebuild the temple in 23.1.2.

⁸⁹ This edict is normally dated after the death of Constantius, to early 362. Barnes, however, dates it prior to Constantius' death, arguing that Julian was seeking to win the support of bishops unhappy with Constantius' ecclesiastical party.

⁹⁰ See discussion in Hanson, 639–653, and Barnes, 155–160.

⁹¹ A sentiment echoed by Sozomen, 5.5.

⁹² Aetius was banished by Constantius, first to Mopsuestia and later to the Tarsus mountains, for his words at the Council of Constantinople, 360, which met to ratify the Dated Creed of 359. See Hanson, 600–601; Vaggione, 225–26. Eunomius in turn resigned his see as a result of a variety of charges brought against him, first by his own clergy and later by Acacius of Caesarea. He was never formally deposed, but retired to his estate. See discussions in Hanson, 613–614; Kopecek, 393–410; and Vaggione, 230–231 and 296–302.

⁹³ Philostorgius, 7.6. For a discussion of the organization of the church, see Kopecek, 413–422, and Vaggione, 273–284.

agreement with the other historians in his assessment of Julian, for Philostorgius one of the most important element of Julian's reign was the establishment of the Eunomian church.

As for the later emperors, not surprisingly Philostorgius takes an almost diametrically opposite view as Rufinus. Whereas Rufinus attempted to portray Jovian as inclining towards Athanasius and Nicene theology, Philostorgius presents him as taking a neutral position. He tells us that two of the emperor's relatives, a certain Candidus and Arrianus, came to him and sought to prevent him from being reconciled with Athanasius.⁹⁴ Jovian, however, refused to be swayed to either faction, and referred "that which was said on either side to common deliberation," most likely meaning a council of the church, "showing no clear inclination to either side."⁹⁵ As for Valens, Philostorgius lacks the negative assessment of his reign as contained in the synoptic historians. There is no mention of any persecutions of the Egyptian monks, nor of any confrontation between Basil and the emperor. Valens, in fact, figures very little in Philostorgius. Philostorgius' account of Valens' reign is dominated by his attempts to exonerate Eunomius and Aetius from any involvement in the revolt of Procopius, in particular noting that Eunomius was absent from the estate he owned when Procopius took refuge there.⁹⁶ Philostorgius' description bears little resemblance to the portrait of the murderous persecutor of Nicene orthodoxy first put forth by Rufinus and later echoed in later historians.

He is more pointed in his critique of another member of the house of Valens, the western emperor Gratian, son of Valentinian I and nephew of Valens. This should not be surprising given Gratian's actions as emperor. After the defeat of Valens by the Goths, Gratian issued an edict of toleration, which excluded, among others, the Eunomians.⁹⁷ Furthermore Gratian became increasingly influenced by the great Western defender of Nicaea, Ambrose of Milan.⁹⁸ The

⁹⁴ Philostorgius, 8.6: "οἱ περὶ Κάνδιδον καὶ Ἀρριανόν, προσγενεῖς ὄντες τῷ βασιλεῖ, πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν Ἐδέσῃ παραγίγονται καὶ τῷ Ἀθανασίῳ ἔξοικειώσασθαι τὸν Βασιλέα σπουδάζοντι ἐμποδῶν ἴστανται."

⁹⁵ Philostorgius, 8.6: "πλὴν ὃ γε βασιλεύς, εἰς δίαιταν κοινὴν τὰ παρ' ἑκατέρου μέρους λεγόμενα ἀναθέμενος, ῥοπήν οὐδετέροις τέως παρέσχεν ἐπίδηλον."

⁹⁶ Philostorgius, 9.5: "οὐδὲ ἐπιδημοῦντος."

⁹⁷ The edict of no longer extant, but it is mentioned in Socrates 5.2 and Sozomen 7.1.

⁹⁸ For a brief description of Gratian's religious policy, see Hanson, *Search*, 793–95.

true extent of Philostorgius' dislike of Gratian, however, is lost in the Photian summary. Photius tells us that in his account of Gratian's death "Philostorgius invented many slanders against Gratian."⁹⁹ This summary does not do justice to the extent of Philostorgius' enmity towards Gratian. Philostorgius in fact compared Gratian to Nero, the great tyrant and persecutor of Christians. As Photius writes, "he makes up and notes many slanders against Gratian, even comparing him to Nero." His reason for doing so was a direct result of Gratian's religious' policy, a result of Gratian's profession (in Photius' words) "of the right opinion of faith."¹⁰⁰

Philostorgius' depiction of Theodosius is not as neutral as his portraits of Jovian and Valens. He notes that Theodosius' first action after entering Constantinople in triumph was to hand over the churches to the holders of the doctrine of homoousios.¹⁰¹ Philostorgius also tells us that he took punitive measures as well, and "expelled the Arians and Eunomians from the city."¹⁰² In noting the repressive measures adopted by Theodosius Philostorgius maintains the distinctions which have been a central piece of his history. As he did in Book 2 in his discussion of the actions and beliefs of Arius and the followers of Lucian after the Council of Nicaea, in his description of Theodosius' actions Philostorgius continues to separate his own theological party from that of Arius. The actions Theodosius took against non-Nicene groups affected Philostorgius directly. As with Gratian's decree in the West, one of the groups specifically singled out in the Theodosian Code are the Eunomians, often lumped together with other undesirables such as the Manicheans. For this reason, Philostorgius included in his history a devastating critique of Theodosius in the chapter describing his death, just as he did in his treatment of Gratian. Just as Photius in his epitome severely edits Philostorgius' description of Gratian, he likewise edits his version of Theodosius' death.

After his defeat of the usurper, Photius tells us that Theodosius died quietly in his bed, having secured peace for the empire and

⁹⁹ Philostorgius, 10.5: "πολλὰς δὲ καὶ διαβολὰς ὁ συγγραφεὺς κατὰ Γρατιανοῦ ἀναπλάττει."

¹⁰⁰ Philostorgius, 10.5: "ώς καὶ τῷ Νέρωνι παρεικάζειν αὐτόν· οὐ γάρ ἥρκεσεν αὐτῷ, ώς ἔσικεν, τῆς ἐκείνου πίστεως τὸ ὄρθρόδοξον."

¹⁰¹ Philostorgius, 9.19: "καὶ τοῖς μὲν τὸ ὅμοούσιον φρονοῦσι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπιτρέπει τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν."

¹⁰² Philostorgius, 9.19: "Αρειανοὺς δὲ καὶ Εὐνομιανοὺς ἀπελαύνει τῆς πόλεως."

elevated his two sons Arcadius and Honorius to the purple. Inserting a first-person commentary, Photius tells us that in this blissful state of affairs “he received the honor, it seems to me, for his burning zeal against idols.”¹⁰³ Yet in addition to his editorializing Photius preserves a fragment of Philostorgius’ critique. He tells us that concerning

the blessed Theodosius the impious one is not ashamed to slander him with ill temper and luxurious excess, and writes that it was on account of this that he succumbed to dropsy.¹⁰⁴

As with Gratian, Philostorgius’ negative assessment of Theodosius is in response to the particular bias against his own theological party. Even in the bowdlerized Photian epitome, we can discern the comment element in Philostorgius’ description: both men are characterized as tyrants. Gratian is explicitly linked with Nero, while Theodosius is described as suffering death befitting a tyrant. His foul inner nature manifested itself in the corruption of his outer body.¹⁰⁵

Thus in essence there is little methodological difference between Rufinus and Philostorgius in their assessments of the emperors who succeeded Constantius. Rulers deemed favorable to their cause are given positive treatment, while those opposed vilified. Imperial authority is an essential element in religious identity throughout the fourth century, and with Rufinus and Philostorgius we see two historians actively constructing an imperial identity to justify their faith communities. The historical record is not paramount: the relationship between one’s community of belief and imperial authority is.

IV. THE MAKING OF HOLY MEN: AETIUS, EUNOMIUS, AND DOCTRINAL PURITY

Thus while Rufinus has a vested interest in creating a link between Athanasius and the Council of Nicaea, Philostorgius’ main task in

¹⁰³ Philostorgius, 10.2: “τοῦ θερμοῦ μοι δοκῶ κατὰ τῶν εἰδόλων ζήλου τοῦτο γέρας ἔξενεγκάνν.”

¹⁰⁴ Philostorgius, 10.2: “Ταῦτα λέγων ὁ δυσσεβῆς περὶ τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου Θεοδοσίου, οὐκ αἰσχύνεται κωμῳδεῖν αὐτὸν ἐπ’ ἀκρασίᾳ βίου καὶ τρυφῆς ἀμετρίᾳ, δι’ ἣν αὐτὸν ἀλῶνται γράφει καὶ τῷ τοῦ ὑδέρου νοσήματι.”

¹⁰⁵ For parallels on the death of the wicked, see Josephus’ description of the death of Agrippa, *Jewish Antiquities* 19.8, with parallels in Acts 12:21–23; Eusebius on the deaths of the persecutors Galerius, *Ecclesiastical History* 8.16.1–2, and Maximin, 9.10.14; Athanasius on Arius, *Letter to Serapion on the Death of Arius*.

Books 1–2 of his *Ecclesiastical History* is to discredit Nicaea and instead rank the non-Nicene theologians according to their fidelity to the school of Lucian as read through his own Eunomian perspective. In this regard Rufinus the Nicene and Philostorgius and the non-Nicene have more in common than one would initially consider. Both are interpreting the events surrounding the Council of Nicaea according to concerns peculiar to their theological perspective.

Philostorgius also proceeds along a similar track in the latter books of his history. As Athanasius and the Cappadocians functioned for Rufinus, Philostorgius actively constructs the two great founders of his school of thought, Aetius and Eunomius, as holy men, wonder-workers, and teachers. His concern for doctrinal purity in the first generation of Lucianic disciples is a necessary prelude to his introduction and description of Aetius and Eunomius. All the people singled out as particularly faithful followers of the master will in turn play influential roles in the careers of Aetius and Eunomius.¹⁰⁶

Philostorgius begins his discussion of Aetius in 3.14 of his *Ecclesiastical History*, and in presenting this material evidences a distinct shift in his work. He marks the passing of the Lucianic torch to the next generation of theologians. Prior to this point, he has been concerned with explicating the place of the school of Lucian and imperial authority in the development of his theological traditions. Beginning with 3.14, the new emphasis will be on outlining the development of Philostorgius' own theological party, in particular the role played by the two great founders, Aetius and Eunomius. The school of thought which these two created will be a different from the one described in the opening books of his work. The emphasis on doctrinal purity, which was an important element in his assessments of the disciples of Lucian, becomes an essential element to the emerging Eunomian party. Philostorgius marks this shift in 3.14. He tells

¹⁰⁶ Vaggione also notes the wonderworking abilities of Aetius, Eunomius, and Theophilus. As noted above, while in essential agreement with Vaggione my argument differs in two aspects. The first is to forego reconstructions of the historical Aetius, Eunomius, or Lucian and instead focus on their portrayals in Philostorgius. We can see that they are more than god-touched rhetors in Philostorgius; they are holy men whose gifts are manifestations of divine favor and power. Secondly, looking at the wonderworking descriptions of Aetius, Eunomius, and Theophilus within the larger framework of Philostorgius' church history allows to see how he stands both in continuity and discontinuity with the development of Nicene historiography.

us that, though they “differed in regards to beliefs,” the homoousians and “the Arians” nonetheless continued to worship together, albeit except for communing with one another:

Those who were with Aetius, although they differed according to their beliefs from those who preached homousios, nonetheless participated in prayers, hymns, deliberations, and all other matters except in the mystical sacrifice.¹⁰⁷

This state of affairs changed with Aetius, however. Rather than remaining on close terms with those with whom they disagreed, when Aetius appeared on the scene he convinced a group of followers to separate themselves from the Nicene “heterodox,” “breaking all bonds of friendship and intimacy.”¹⁰⁸

Having introduced Aetius as the one who brought about a fundamental shift in the relationship between Nicene and non-Nicenes, in a lengthy and important chapter Philostorgius gives an account of Aetius’ upbringing. In Eunomius’ later confrontations with the Cappadocians, Aetius’ background would become a source of discussion. Gregory of Nyssa in particular felt the need to impugn Aetius’ upbringing, saying that in his youth he was a common household slave, then a bronzesmith who was dismissed under accusations of dishonesty.¹⁰⁹ In his detailed description of Aetius’ early career, Kopeczek presents Aetius as an example of the upward mobility that education and a career in the church provided in the fourth century, noting that Aetius moved from indentured servant to intimate of the Caesar Gallus in his short lifetime.¹¹⁰

Though the events of his life are fairly well-known, scholarly attention has failed to set this description of Aetius within the context of Philostorgius’ *Ecclesiastical History*. While we may never know the exact particulars of Aetius’ career, what is important is that in his description of Aetius Philostorgius begins to develop a theme which will

¹⁰⁷ Philostorgius, 3.14: “εἰ καὶ διεφέροντο κατὰ τὰς δόξας τοῖς τὸ ὁμοούσιον πρεσβεύοντιν οἱ ἔξ Ἀρείου, ὅμως καὶ εὐχῶν καὶ ὕμνων καὶ βουλευμάτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων σχεδὸν ἀπάντων πλὴν τῆς μυστικῆς ἐκοινώνουν θυσίας.”

¹⁰⁸ Philostorgius, 3.14: “ἐπιγενομένου δὲ τοῦ Ἀετίου καὶ τῆς ἐν τούτοις διαστάσεως ἀρξαντος, τὴν ὁμόδοξον συναγωγήν, πάντας δεσμοὺς καὶ φιλίας καὶ συνηθείας οἵς τοῖς ἐτεροδόξοις συνήπτοντο διαρρήξαντας, εἰς ἀντίπαλον τούτοις μάλιστα παρασκευάσαι καταστῆναι μοῖραν.”

¹⁰⁹ Gregory, *Against Eunomius* 1.37–46.

¹¹⁰ Kopeczek, 61.

take on increasing importance throughout the remainder of his history: actively constructing Aetius and Eunomius as holy men and teachers who establish a rigorous standard of doctrinal purity as the basis of their ecclesiastical community. In his recent work, Richard Lim includes a discussion of the Anomean [sic] controversy as part of a larger analysis of the roles that disputation and the study of rhetoric played in Late Antiquity. For Lim, Aetius and Eunomius' skill in dialetic allows them to transcend their humble beginnings and places them in positions of power and authority in the empire.¹¹¹ What Lim, Kopecek, and others authors have failed to take into account is how these descriptions of Aetius and Eunomius fit within the larger context of Philostorgius' history and apologetic. Their skill in *techne* is part of Philostorgius' depiction of Aetius and Eunomius as holy men; skill in disputation is not only a method of social advancement, but also a manifestation of divine favor and power. They are not only god-touched rhetors; they are holy men on par with any bishop or monk.

Indeed, Philostorgius does not deny that Aetius came from humble beginnings. After the death of his father he informs us Aetius became a smith. After working diligently for several years, Aetius' fortune began to turn. Philostorgius tells us that "on account of his powerful nature he began to study logic,"¹¹² and was noticed by Paulinus, fellow member of Eusebius' school of Caesarea and newly translated to the see of Tyre. Already, before having any formal schooling, Philostorgius describes Aetius as possessing an innate "powerful nature" which led him to study logic. Like the young Athanasius who had a sacramental presence and understanding beyond his years, as described in Rufinus, the young Aetius is likewise gifted with his future power. While studying under Paulinus, Aetius' skill in logic and disputation grew. After the death of his mother Aetius applied himself even moreso to his studies, and roused the envy of his fellow students. It was only while Paulinus lived that this envy was kept in check.¹¹³ In his time with Paulinus, Aetius' natural proclivity towards logic and disputation became evident, but after the accession of

¹¹¹ Lim, *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*, 112–122.

¹¹² Philostorgius, 3.15: "διὰ δόμην φύσεος ἐπὶ τὰς λογικὰς ἐπιστραφῆναι μαθήσεις."

¹¹³ Philostorgius, 3.15: "ἀλλὰ μέχρι μὲν ὁ Παυλῖνος ἔζη, τὴν ισχὺν ὁ φθόνος παρηρέιτο." For a discussion of the envy motif, see Lim, 112–114, and Vaggione, 14–20.

Eulalius those envious of Aetius manage to have him exiled by the bishop.

After Paulinus' initial patronage, Aetius returns to his trade as a goldsmith, though still continuing to engage in disputations with any who sought them.¹¹⁴ As with Paulinus, Aetius' natural ability attracts another patron, “a certain grammarian” living in Anagarbus. With this new patron Aetius lives as a household servant in return for learning grammar. Quickly Aetius comes to know more than his master, and publicly reproached him for a wrong interpretation of the divine oracles. He was subsequently expelled from the household.¹¹⁵

These initial confrontations between Aetius and his opponents serve an important introductory purpose in Philostorgius. In their discussions of Aetius' early career, Kopecek and Lim both note his contentious nature. Kopecek in particular paints a portrait of Aetius as uncompromising, a stickler for minute points of argument, arrogant and tactless. Kopecek fails to take into account the important ecclesiastical community-building which is an aspect of Philostorgius' church history. Contrary to Kopecek, Aetius is not a tactless confrontationalist. Rather, he is the forerunner of doctrinal purity, and the seeds of his innate intelligence and unwillingness to countenance any form of error are the key elements which emerge from this portrayal of his early years. Likewise the development of Aetius' skill in disputation is not only means for social advancement, it is part of Philostorgius' depiction of him as a holy man and wonderworker.

At this point, having demonstrated Aetius' natural intelligence and ability in disputation, Philostorgius tells us that he proceeds to study with a succession of teachers explicitly linked to the school of Lucian. Here Aetius' initial concern for precision and correctness interfaces

¹¹⁴ Philostorgius, 3.15: “οὐδὲ τῆς ἐν λόγοις ἀφιστάμενος πρὸς τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας ὄμιλλης.”

¹¹⁵ Philostorgius, 3.15. The nature of this dispute is not entirely clear. The text notes that the differences was over the interpretation of “τῶν θείων λογίων.” Given that Aetius was studying with a grammarian, and not a cleric, that the next sentence mentions him beginning the study of the Bible, and the fact that the common expression for the Scriptures is γραφή, not λόγιος, the dispute between Aetius and his teacher could have something to do with a point of translation in reference to Homer or various Greek classical authors used practically as textbooks in the ancient study of grammar. This is not certain, however, since Philostorgius also uses the same word in reference to the prophecies of the Delphic oracle in 7.12. Nevertheless, one should not mistake this confrontation was a matter of difference in Scriptural exegesis.

with the pure stream of proper doctrine emerging from the school of Lucian, and Philostorgius spends much of the rest of the chapter outlining Aetius' studies. Aetius begins his studies in Scripture with Athanasius, bishop of Anabarzus and disciple of Lucian. With Athanasius Aetius studied the gospels, and "having learned each one,"¹¹⁶ moved on to his next teacher, Antony of Tarsus, another disciple of Lucian, with whom he studied Paul's epistles. Upon Antony's elevation to the see of Tarsus, Aetius moved on again, finally studying the book of Ezekiel with his future patron Leontius of Antioch, disciple of Lucian, and future bishop of Antioch.¹¹⁷ There is some discussion as to whether Aetius' progression from studying the gospels, epistles, and then prophets represented a some sort of standard course of study in the fourth century. Regardless of late antique curricula, what is important for Philostorgius is to demonstrate how Aetius was steeped in the traditions of the school of Lucian through the master's prominent disciples.

In discussing Aetius' period of study under Leontius, Philostorgius returned to his theme of persecution, and informs us that Aetius was forced from the city on account of the envy of his colleagues.¹¹⁸ At this point Philostorgius combines his motif of Aetius as the gifted expositor of proper Lucianic doctrine and fuses it with Aetius as wonderworker and holy man. He tells us that Aetius encountered a member of the "Gnostic" sect of the Borboriani and meets his match. Aetius was bested "and cast down into utter defeat."¹¹⁹ Chastened, Aetius begins to question whether life itself is even worth living before he experiences the direct intervention of God. Philostorgius relates a vision which Aetius received in his humbled and dejected state. In this vision God conferred on Aetius a divine gift: wisdom from God which enabled him to never be defeated again:

and while Aetius was in such a mood, he [Philostorgius] relates a marvelous tale: a vision appeared, which destroyed his faintheartedness, and with signs demonstrated the wisdom offered to him. And from that time it supported him, and not once was he defeated in disputation.¹²⁰

¹¹⁶ Philostorgius, 3.15: "καθ' ἔκαστον αὐτὸν ἐπιστήσας."

¹¹⁷ For a discussion of Aetius' course of studies, see Vaggione, 14–26.

¹¹⁸ Philostorgius, 3.15: "ἀλλὰ κάκειθεν αὐτὸν ὁ φθόνος αὐθίς..."

¹¹⁹ Philostorgius, 3.15: "εἰς ἐσχάτην κατέστησεν ἡτταν."

¹²⁰ Philostorgius, 3.15: "οὕτω δὲ τῷ Ἀετίῳ διακειμένῳ ὀπτασίᾳ τις, ώς οὗτος τερ-

Not long after receiving this vision, Aetius avenges his last defeat. He travels from Antioch to Alexandria to engage a certain Aphthonius in debate. Whereas previously he had been bested by a “gnostic,” in the rematch he is pitted against a different kind of a heretic: Aphthonius is a Manichee. Empowered by divine wisdom and the confidence which it inspired in him, Aetius is able to utterly defeat his opponent. Not only that, but Aetius is so powerful in his disputation that within seven days of his defeat Aphthonius dies. Philostorgius tells us that Aetius traveled far and wide, overcoming all of his adversaries. In addition he began to study the art of medicine,¹²¹ not merely to support himself, but “so that he might cure diseases not only of the soul but of the body.”¹²² Far from being a comment about social mobility in late antique Syria, Philostorgius’ mention of Aetius’ study of medicine is a direct extension of his portrayal as a divine holy man who has been given a gift of wisdom and skill in disputation to complement his study in the school of Lucian. With the accession of Leontius to the see of Antioch, Aetius’ career advances. He is ordained to the diaconate and begins to teach publicly in Antioch.¹²³ He maintains his fidelity to proper doctrine, expressed in breaking fellowship with those who remain in communion with the followers of the Nicene doctrine of homoousios. Philostorgius even tells us that Aetius refused to be nominated for the episcopate because the offer came from Secundus and Serras, who were still in communion with homoousians.

Though the books of his *Ecclesiastical History* are divided chronologically, 3.15 is the culmination of the opening books of the work. It is one of the longest chapters which Photius preserves. Given that one cannot assume that the length of the chapters in the epitome

απολογεῖ, ἐφίσταται λύουσα τὴν ἀθυμίαν, συμβόλοις παρεχομένη τὸ ἀνανταγώνιστον τῆς ἥδη παρεχομένης αὐτῷ σοφίας. κάκείθεν παραγεγόνει τῷ Ἀετίῳ τὸ μηδενὸς ἐν συμπλοκαῖς ἡττᾶσθαι λόγων.” See discussion in Vaggione, 23–24. Vaggione notes that “Aetius received what he believed was a divine confirmation of his mission and a promise of future invincibility (Vaggione, 23).” This further demonstrates the different perspective taken by myself and Vaggione: putting aside how Aetius may have interpreted this event, for the development of historiography of the fourth century it is more important to demonstrate how this incident functions within the context of Philostorgius’ work.

¹²¹ A detail corroborated by Gregory of Nyssa in his *Against Eunomius* 1.42–44.

¹²² Philostorgius, 3.15: “ώς ὅν μὴ μόνον ψυχῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σωμάτων ἔχοι τὰς νόσους ιᾶσθαι.”

¹²³ Philostorgius, 3.16.

reflects the length in Philostorgius' original work, nonetheless from the sheer number of events Photius preserves, in its original form the chapter must have been quite lengthy. Philostorgius' presentation of Aetius is akin to Rufinus' portrayal of Athanasius. Aetius is in a sense the second founder of the school of Lucian; gifted with innate intelligence, he is the leader of a second generation of persons emerging from the traditions of the martyr, just as the young Athanasius was gifted leader of persons loyal to the theology of Alexandria and the Nicene Council. Further Aetius is more than just a leader blessed with intelligence; as with Rufinus, Philostorgius actively constructs him as a holy man. But he does so in a different fashion: Aetius' power is shown through his gift in disputation, his intelligence, his fidelity to proper interpretation, and, later, his miracles. All of these elements will become significant pieces of Philostorgius' own identity as inheritor of the Actian-Eunomian traditions.

Philostorgius' other great hero, Eunomius, receives similar treatment. According to Philostorgius, Eunomius is commended to Aetius by none other than the Libyan bishop Serras, with whom Aetius refused to be in communion. Eunomius was attracted to Aetius, "having heard of his wisdom"¹²⁴ and traveled from his native Cappadocia to meet him in Alexandria. The pattern of succession of teaching is repeated: Eunomius, a man who made his living by learning a trade,¹²⁵ like Aetius, repeats his master's pattern. As Aetius moved in with the disciples of the martyr Lucian, so Eunomius lives with Aetius and studies with him, and begins his course in "sacred learning."¹²⁶ For Philostorgius, Aetius is the founder of the school of thought which properly interpreted and carried on the teachings of the martyr Lucian.

Philostorgius' demonstrates Eunomius' power of persuasion in two separate instances. The first concerns the events surrounding his tenure while bishop of Cyzicus. For various reasons several of the Cyzican clergy accused Eunomius to Eudoxius, bishop of Constantinople.¹²⁷ Eudoxius provides an opportunity for Eunomius to make

¹²⁴ Philostorgius, 3.20: "κατὰ πύστιν τῆς Ἀετίου σοφίας," recalling the σοφία given to Aetius in his divine vision.

¹²⁵ Gregory of Nyssa tells us that Eunomius began his career as a short-hand writer and teacher. See Gregory, *Against Eunomius*, 1.49–54.

¹²⁶ Philostorgius, 3.20: "οὐ δὲ τοῖς ιεροῖς μαθήμασι συνασκούμενος."

¹²⁷ See discussion in Kopecek, 392–404.

his defense before the clergy of the capital, and in doing so Eunomius demonstrates his rhetorical prowess. Eunomius is so eloquent that he not only brings the hostile crowd over to his own opinions but that, instead of being accusers, they instead become witnesses to Eunomius' piety, including Eudoxius:

When Eunomius made his defense before the clergy of Constantinople, who were wound up in an uproar, he not only won over to his opinions the one who had been opposed to him [Eudoxius], but they [the clergy/crowd] became witnesses to his piety.¹²⁸

An apt pupil, Eunomius not only demonstrates his rhetorical powers, but turns his former adversaries into advocates of his εὐσέβεια. Furthermore, like Aetius, Eunomius' words have deadly force. Just as Aetius brought his Manichean opponent to death, so does Eunomius destroy his greatest opponent, Basil of Caesarea. Philostorgius informs us that both Apollinarius and Basil wrote works against Eunomius, and that Eunomius replied to Basil in a work of five books. Having read just the first book, however, Basil "became so weighed down that he died."¹²⁹

These examples of the power of Eunomius' skills in disputation must be set within the larger framework of Philostorgius' narrative. They do not only demonstrate the innate ability in Aetius and Eunomius; they are part of the larger portrayal of the two founders of the school. The necessary context to Philostorgius' description is something which simply has not been part of previous interpretations of the role of disputation. In addition to the divine manifestations of their rhetorical skills, Aetius and Eunomius also reveal divine favor through their powers as miracle workers. During one of his exiles, Philostorgius tells us, Aetius interceded with God and saved the village to which he was exiled from the plague.¹³⁰ Furthermore, Philostorgius apparently recounted other miracles by members of the Lucianic school, including Aetius, his patron Leontius, Eunomius, and, above all, Theophilus the Indian.¹³¹

¹²⁸ Philostorgius, 6.1: “ώς μὴ μόνον εἰς τὴν ἐναντίαν μεταστῆσαι δόξαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μάρτυρας αὐτοῦ θεμούντης εὐσέβειάς γενέσθαι.” Curiously Vaggione overlooks this incident in his descriptions of Aetius and Eunomius as *periti*.

¹²⁹ Philostorgius, 8.12: “ἐντυχεῖν ἐκεῖνον τῷ πρώτῳ καὶ βαρυθυμήσαντα λιπεῖν τὸν βίον.”

¹³⁰ Philostorgius, 5.2: “αὐχμοῦ δὲ καὶ λοιμοῦ τὴν χώραν ἔχοντος ἀνυποστάτου, ὡς οὗτος ὁ δυσσεβῆς ψευδολογεῖ, τὸν Ἀέτιον ἐξιλεωσάμενον τὸ θεῖον λῦσαι μὲν τὰ δεινά, παμπόλλης δὲ τυχεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνοικούντων εὐνοίας τε καὶ σεβασμιότητος.”

¹³¹ Philostorgius, 9.1: “The ninth book of Philostorgius contains some wonderful

Along with Aetius and Eunomius, Philostorgius consistently portrayed Theophilus as a wonderworker. As noted above, Theophilus was also a member of the Lucianic school, ordained deacon by Eusebius the Great. His theology was considered orthodox by Philostorgius, who notes that he “chose the true faith concerning God.”¹³² Theophilus, unlike some other members of the school, chose the monastic life. He was selected for the mission to India, and ordained to the episcopate by liked-minded persons. While in India he won over the local king through the miracles which he performed. As a result of Theophilus’ mission the area was won over to Christianity. Philostorgius further relates that Theophilus healed Constantius’ wife.¹³³ The role of Theophilus in Philostorgius’ history demonstrates that the dichotomy between Nicene and non-Nicene is not simply over the way in which power is expressed. It is not a question of non-Nicenes being consumed by their proclivity towards disputation, or of their becoming a hopelessly intellectual elitist philosophical school rather than a church.¹³⁴ It is not simply a conflict between asceticism and dialectic—though this is precisely what Rufinus would like to believe, and which many historians have argued. Theophilus is a monk, and an ascetic, and a wonderworker—yet he draws his strength as Aetius and Eumomius do, from belonging to the Lucianic lineage and holding the correct opinions concerning God. Their power flows from their right belief; the only real distinction between Aetius, Eunomius, and Theophilus is the way in which their

miracles wrought by the hands of Aetius, Eunomius, and Leontius—inventions of the author; as likewise some others wrought by Candidus, Evagrius, Arrianus, and Florentius; but above all, by Theophilus the Indian . . .” Walford translation, 491.

¹³² Philostorgius, 3.5.

¹³³ Philostorgius, 4.7.

¹³⁴ Kopecek essentially considered the Aetian/Eunomian party as a “sect,” rather than a church; see Kopecek’s description, 412–440. For Lim, Aetius’ and Eunomius’ contentiousness revealed to their contemporary opponents the Cappadocians their lack of proper grounding in *paidea* (140–143) and was incongruous with the ethical and social developments in Christian asceticism (144–148). Lim further argues that Philostorgius’ attempts to introduce elements of asceticism are a result of Cappadocian critique; rather, as I have shown, they need to be set within the larger framework of his history. Asceticism and orthodoxy are not necessarily the opposites of dialectic and heresy. Vaggione’s work critiques Lim by arguing for a certain type of asceticism among non-Nicenes; see Vaggione, 190–192. Rather Vaggione argues that the differences between Athanasius and the Cappadocians on the one hand and Aetius and Eunomius on the other had to do with the fact that the Nicenes were willing to relax their theological categories to broaden their political base while Aetius and Eunomius, clinging to their doctrinal purity, were unable to extend their teachings beyond their immediate circle of followers. See Vaggione, 364–368.

right belief empowers them as holy men of God. Philostorgius tells us that all three specifically perform miracles, and that through their words and deeds many were brought over to belief in God. “Heretics” are holy men, ascetics, and wonderworkers as well.

In regards to reinterpretation of the recent past, Philostorgius’ church history functions much the same way as Rufinus. Like Rufinus, Philostorgius links his historical material to his current situation. Rufinus made sure to include his teacher Diodore in his history. Philostorgius likewise makes plain his relationship to his historical material. A fellow Cappadocian like himself, Eunomius was a personal hero to Philostorgius. He included in his *Ecclesiastical History* an encomium on Eunomius which Photius chose to omit completely.¹³⁵ Later he describes a meeting between himself and Eunomius.¹³⁶ Philostorgius also includes his family in his work. His mother was the daughter of the presbyter in the village of Borissus. Her husband was a follower of Eunomius, who eventually converted his wife from her homoousian opinions. His mother, in turn, converted the remainder of her family, including her father the presbyter.¹³⁷ In doing so Philostorgius brings his myth of origins down to the present. Philostorgius, brought up in a Eunomian family—a “cradle Eunomian,” as it were—who himself met the teacher, plants himself firmly in the succession of proper teaching beginning with Lucian and extending to the present. He provides a link between his own community and the succession of teaching and the proper doctrine of God as derived from the school of Lucian the martyr. Even the construction of his history bears witness to the self-referential nature: a history in twelve books, each one beginning with a different letter of his name.¹³⁸ The past is again prologue: history is part of the formation of current community identity.

¹³⁵ Photius summarizes Philostorgius’ chapter in one sentence: “This impious one [Philostorgius] composed an encomium on Eunomius, and is not ashamed of it (Philostorgius, 3.21).”

¹³⁶ Philostorgius, 10.6.

¹³⁷ Philostorgius, 9.9.

¹³⁸ Thus perhaps functioning more than “a literary conceit (not uncommon in the fourth and fifth centuries,” as noted by Photius and related in Nobbs, “Alternative Ideology,” 276.

V. CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have shown how Philostorgius presents a detailed apology for a non-Nicene version of Christianity. Philostorgius, as an upholder of the theology of Eunomius, shows himself standing in a long succession of teachers who derive from the school of Lucian the martyr. He attempts to show that the current predominance of Nicene Christianity is the work of the conspiracy between Alexander and Ossius at Nicaea, compounded by the machinations of Athanasius in the years following, in spite of emperors sympathetic to his own doctrine of heterousios. He presents his heroes Aetius and Eunomius as holy men and wonderworkers, and himself as the current link to this succession of teaching.

Reading Philostorgius' history in such a manner challenges conventional understanding of the history of the church in the fourth century. The church historians who followed Socrates onward were willing to overlook discrepancies, exaggerations, and outright fabrications in Rufinus' work because it was in line with their own theological opinion. Later generations of scholars, building on the foundations of the synoptic historians, accepted the work of Socrates and his successors as historical fact. This allowed them to discredit the witness of Philostorgius as a liar and a heretic. However if one is to discard an a prior privileging of a Nicene version of the fourth century, Philostorgius' work stands in a different light. It calls us to reject making easy distinctions between heretical and orthodox, ascetic and dialectician, monk and agitator. If we are to indeed abandon Nicene historical hegemony as scholarly consensus has abandoned the "Arian" categorization, then Philostorgius and his vision of non-Nicene Christianity must be taken seriously.

Taking Philostorgius seriously breaks down juxtapositions of heresy and orthodoxy. It reveals a Philostorgius very close to Rufinus: both are actively constructing a narrative which appropriates history for one's own theological community. Furthermore, it points us towards another possible answer as to why non-Nicene Christianity did not prevail in the years following the Council of Nicaea. For this we turn to the conclusion.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION: THE REVOLUTION OF NICENE HISTORIOGRAPHY

The church historians of the late fourth and early fifth century had an important role to play in the theological controversies of their time. Scholarship has tended to focus on the place of theologians in the development of Christian doctrine, seeing church history as the background in which these figures operated, necessary for providing context but clearly in a secondary category in regard to lasting influence. Complementing this scholarship with an equal amount of scrutiny of the church historians, we have seen how Eusebius, the anonymous chronicler, Rufinus, and Philostorgius are integral components in the development of Nicene and non-Nicene understandings of this time period. Church histories functioned alongside exegetical, liturgical, and doctrinal works as texts produced by communities of belief loyal to particular theological traditions, tracing authority from a succession of teachers.

Eusebius of Caesarea's *Ecclesiastical History* has often been seen as the foundation for subsequent church history. Various authors have shown how Eusebius was influential in his method of collecting source materials, establishing a succession of bishops within principle dioceses, documenting the development of the biblical canon, and noting the providential nature of Christianity operating within the Roman world, among other influences on later historians. In this work I have shown another way in which Eusebius served as a model for writing church history. As much as any work of theology, Eusebius' defense of the school of Caesarea is an explication and advancement of the theology, cosmology, and exegesis he learned from Pamphilus and the Caesarean school of Origen. Placing the oft-overlooked Panegyrical Oration in Book 10 of the *Ecclesiastical History* and the oft-maligned *Life of Constantine* within this framework allows for the holistic integration of these works into a larger understanding of Eusebius' work as a theologian, and provides a greater appreciation of the scope and depth of his historical work. There is no clear distinction between church history and theology as distinct genres.

Rather the legacy of the school of Caesarea permeates the entire fabric of Eusebius' work.

Eusebius established a paradigm for writing church history as an apologetic narrative of one's theological tradition. This perspective allows us to bridge the gap between anachronistic designations such as "heresy" and "orthodoxy" and see commonalities between various groups of Christians in the fourth century rather than perceived differences. The anonymous chronicler of the mid-fourth century and the historical works of Athanasius of Alexandria stand in continuity with this Eusebian paradigm. Church history for both authors finds its foundation in the defense of a particular theological tradition. Alexandrian and Lucianic perspectives are part of the same apologetic framework rather than polar opposites. In addition the work of the anonymous chronicler, by showing his fidelity to the Lucianic school, also serves to demonstrate the diversity of theological opinion in the fourth century. Traditionally labeled as an "Arian," identifying the community of belief that he defends provides a deeper understanding of the theological traditions of his community. Diversity in theological opinion necessitates examining diversity in historical expression. The recovery of the non-Nicene chronicler's narrative bears witness to this.

This paradigm takes a dramatic shift in the work of Rufinus. Like Eusebius, Rufinus incorporated an apologetic element for the school of Origen in his translation of Books 1–9 of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*. Furthermore Rufinus modified this apology in his treatment of subsequent events. Rather than presenting the "Arian" controversy as Eusebius did, he incorporates an Athanasian perspective on the events of the fourth century. Rufinus provided the historical narrative to the "Arian" controversy as it emerged from the polemical work of Athanasius. Taking polemic as fact, through falsification of historical detail he worked to exonerate the emperor Constantine and lay the blame for dissension in the church at the feet of Constantius, and recounted the attempts of an organized and systematic group of followers of the presbyter Arius to influence the emperor and to bring down Athanasius.

Yet Rufinus goes a step further than providing the narrative framework to his Athanasian source. In addition he evidences a paradigm shift in understandings of authority in the church which would be an important contribution to the development of Nicene historiography. Rufinus' work reflects the rise of the Christian monastic move-

ment and the increasing role of the bishop in the imperial church. These developments can be seen in the manner in which Rufinus treats Athanasius, Basil of Caesarea, and Gregory of Nazianzus. He actively constructs Athanasius as a holy man. Furthermore after Athanasius' death Rufinus identifies the locus of power in the Christian church as resting with the burgeoning monastic movement. In doing so he provides portraits of a number of holy men, including his own teacher Didymus, and recounts a variety of persecutions by the emperor Valens (in the process fixing Valens' image in the subsequent memory of the church). The new exemplars of authority in the church are Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus. For Rufinus these two (not three) Cappadocians establish complementary paradigms of authority for the Christian church. In these two figures both of the new loci of power—monk and bishop—come together. Basil and Gregory are ascetics fortified by biblical study from the perspective of Origen, and who recast the landscape of the church in their roles as bishop. Rufinus weds the Eusebian paradigm of writing church history as loyalty to one's theological tradition to new understandings of power in church. Rather than authority flowing from the founder handed down to prominent teachers, authority is manifested in the monk-bishop.

Philostorgius of Borissus likewise modifies the Eusebian paradigm of church history. Philostorgius, like Rufinus, writes a history of the church which serves as an apology for his particular theological views. In addition he also makes a substantial change to the Eusebian paradigm. While showing his indebtedness to the school of Lucian as the forerunner of his own theological traditions, Philostorgius devotes particular attention to Aetius and Eunomius. He actively constructs Aetius, Eunomius, and the prominent Lucianist Theophilus the Indian as wonderworkers and holy men. Philostorgius, while advancing the Eusebian paradigm along the same parameters as Rufinus, still stands in essential continuity with Eusebius. He differs, however, in formalizing the power derived through proper succession. The divine authority and power of Aetius and Eunomius comes from right belief and their proper place in succession from the authoritative teacher, not through their ascetic practice, biblical study, or ecclesiastical office.

Thus while I have shown how in many ways Rufinus and Philostorgius operate along similar methodological tracks, the manner in which they construct paradigms of authority in the church would have lasting impact. Rufinus' characterization was more in

line with the development of authority within the larger parameters of the post-Constantinian church. Authority in the church looked very different in the year 400 than the year 300. Bishops had emerged to take on significant roles in the ordering of Late Antique society. The ascetic movement had become much more widespread, and monks were beginning to wield substantial influence in parts of the East. Rufinus' work demonstrates how the new role of bishop and the influence of monasticism were shaping an understanding of the episcopal office. To put it simply, the ascetic monk-bishop was replacing the authoritative teacher as a marker of authority in the church.

Rufinus' *Ecclesiastical History*, though often overlooked, played a crucial role in the development of Nicene orthodoxy. While Rufinus may have received short shrift by later generations, there is no doubt as to the significance of his church history. In a time period when the majority of Christian works were written in Greek and translated into Latin, Rufinus' work was one of the few written in Latin to be translated into Greek. This fact alone is testimony to its significance and widespread circulation. In addition to its widespread distribution, Rufinus was the most important source for Socrates Scholasticus' account of the fourth century and the "Arian" controversy. Rufinus originally served as the main source of Socrates' first two books, as Socrates himself notes:

Rufinus, who wrote an Ecclesiastical History in Latin, has erred in respect to chronology. For he supposes that what was done against Athanasius occurred after the death of the Emperor Constantine: he was also ignorant of his exile to the Gauls and of various other circumstances. Now we in the first place wrote the first two books of our history following Rufinus; but in writing our history from the third to the seventh, some facts we collected from Rufinus, others from different authors, and some from the narration of individuals still living. Afterward, however, we perused the writings of Athanasius, wherein he depicts his own sufferings and how through the calumnies of the Eusebian faction he was banished, and judged that more credit was due to him who had suffered, and to those who were witnesses of the things they describe, than to such as have been dependent on conjecture, and had therefore erred. Moreover, having obtained several letters of persons eminent at that period, we have availed ourselves of their assistance also in tracing out the truth as far as possible. On this account we were compelled to revise the first and second books of this history, using, however, the testimony of Rufinus where it is evident that he could not be mistaken.¹

¹ Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History*, 2.1; trans. NPNF, Series 2, Vol. II, 37.

Socrates thus relied heavily on Rufinus for the first edition of the first two books of his church history. However it did not take much research for Socrates to note the chronological errors in Rufinus, and accordingly he supplemented Rufinus by privileging the works of Athanasius, along with various letters and certain oral sources. Nonetheless Socrates makes it clear that even in the reworked second edition Rufinus is still an important source. He claims that Rufinus remained a source “where it is evident that he could not be mistaken.” Given that Rufinus’ work ended with the death of Theodosius, Socrates would have used Rufinus as a source for the first five books of his history.² Rufinus, in conjunction with Athanasius, are Socrates’ main sources for his account of the “Arian” controversy.

Through these dual influences of Athanasian polemic and Rufinus’ historical narrative a Nicene perspective on the fourth century was established. In particular, Socrates’ use of Rufinus was instrumental in establishing the place of ascetic wonder-working bishops in a new succession of authority in the church. In fact, the places where Socrates cites Rufinus directly by name in his church history are those which relate directly to his portrayal of Nicaen as holy men and wonderworkers. Socrates reproduces Rufinus’ story of the young Athanasius,³ his account of the attack on the Egyptian monks under the Emperor Valens by Lucius,⁴ and Rufinus’ portrayals of Didymus the Blind and the Cappadocians.⁵ While correcting certain aspects of his chronology, nonetheless Socrates in large part depends on Rufinus for his presentation of Athanasius, the Cappadocians, and the monastic movement. The other synoptic historians, Theodoret and Sozomen, in turn rely on Socrates’ account.⁶ Through the synoptic historians the innovative incorporation of monasticism as a new model of authority in Rufinus became the historical record of the fourth century.

² See Urbainczyk, *Socrates of Constantinople*, 49–52.

³ Socrates, 1.15.

⁴ Socrates, 4.24.

⁵ Socrates, 4.26.

⁶ Sozomen follows Socrates more directly than Theodoret. For example, Sozomen incorporates the material from Socrates/Rufinus on the early years of Athanasius (1.17), the chapter on Didymus and the attacks on the monks of Egypt (3.15), and the description of the Cappadocians (6.17). Theodoret follows the general outline of Socrates but does not borrow as directly from him; for instance he passes over the story of the youthful Athanasius and merely notes that he was “brought up in sacred studies” in Alexandria (1.25). He clearly used the Socrates/Rufinus source material in other places. For example, in 1.23 he includes the story of the conversion of the Iberians which first appeared in Rufinus.

Church history thus has an important role to play in examining the unfolding of the “Arian” controversy. Just as rejecting false distinctions between “heresy” and “orthodoxy” have helped to recover the diversity of opinion which marked the fourth century, rejecting dichotomies between “church history” and “theology” provide another lens to view the time period. Other authors have rejected the distinctions between “heresy” and “orthodoxy” in their attempts to understand the complexity of the theological debate of the fourth century. By retaining distinctions between church history and theology these studies have been lacking an important ingredient in the alchemist’s formula. We can no longer consign church history to the background of studies of the development of doctrine. One additional way to explain the hegemony of Nicene orthodoxy is to examine how Nicenes wrote their history. Through the work of Rufinus, the Nicene church party reflected and incorporated the changing understanding of authority and succession in the church, whereas in Philostorgius we see how one particular group of non-Nicenes did not. By controlling the past, the Nicenes were able to seize the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum Gestarum Libri*. Edited by John C. Rolfe. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Arius, *Letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia*. Greek text in H.G. Opitz, *Urkunden zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites, Athanasius Werke 2:1*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1935, 1–3. Edited and translated by Edward R. Hardy, *Christology of the Later Fathers*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1954.
- . *Letter to Alexander of Alexandria*. Edited by H.G. Opitz, *Urkunden zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites*, 12–13.
- Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos I–III*. Edited by William Bright, *The Orations of St. Athanasius of Alexandria Against the Arians According to the Benedictine Text*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1873.
- . *De Synodis*. Edited by H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, Vol. 2. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1935.
- . *Historia Acephala*. Edited by Annick Martin, *Histoire Acephale et Index Syriaques des lettres festales d'Athanase d'Alexandrie, Sources Chrétienennes* 317. Paris: Cerf, 1985.
- . *Historia Arianorum*. Edited by H.G. Opitz, *Athanasius Werke*, Vol. 2. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1934.
- Basil of Caesarea, *Contra Eunomium*. Edited by Bernard Sesbouë, *Contra Eunome, Sources Chrétienennes*, 299, 305. Paris: Cerf, 1982–83.
- Bidez, Joseph. *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte*. Mit dem Leben des Lucian von Antiochen und den Fragmenten eines Arianischen Historiographen. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1913.
- Chronicon Paschale ad exemplar Vaticananum*. Edited by Ludovic Dindorf. Bonn: Weber, 1832. English translation and notes by Michael Whitby and Mary Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD. Translated Texts for Historians*, Vol. 7. Liverpool: University Press, 1989.
- Epiphanius of Salamis, *Ancoratus und Panarion*. Edited by Karl Holl. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915. English translation by Frank Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*. New York: Brill, 1987.
- Eusebius of Caesarea. *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Edited by Eduard Schwartz and Theodor Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke: die Kirchengeschichte*. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte, Neue Folge, Band 6:1, 6:2. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999. English translation by Kirsopp Lake, *Eusebius: the Ecclesiastical History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- . *Life of Constantine*. Edited by Friedhelm Winkelmann, *Eusebius Werke: Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte, Erster Band, Erster Teil. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975. English translation by Averil Cameron and Stuart G. Hall, *Eusebius: Life of Constantine*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium*. Edited by Werner Jaeger, *Contra Eunomium Libri*. Leiden: Brill, 1960.
- Philostorgius. *Historia ecclesiastica*. Edited by Joseph Bidez, *Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte: mit Leben des Lucian von Antiochen und den Fragmenten eines Arianischen Historiographen*. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der Ersten Jahrhunderte. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1972. English translation by Edward Walford, *The Ecclesiastical History of Philostorgius*. London: Bohn, 1855.

- Rufinus of Aquileia, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Books 10 and 11. Latin text edited by Eduard Schwartz and Theodor Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke: die Kirchengeschichte*. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, Neue Folge, Band 6:2. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1999. English translation and notes by Philip Amidon, *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- . *Tyranni Rufini Opera*. Manilo Simonetti, ed. *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*, Vol. 20. Turnholt: Brepols, 1961.
- Socrates Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Edited by Günther Christian Hansen, *Sokrates Kirchengeschichte*. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, Neue Folge, Band 1. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995.
- Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Edited by Gunther Christian Hansen, *Sozomenus Kirchengeschichte*. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, Neue Folge, Band 4. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995.
- Theodore of Cyrrhus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Greek text edited by Leon Parmentier, *Theodoret Kirchengeschichte*. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller, Neue Folge, Band 5. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1998.
- Theophanes the Confessor, *Chronographia*. Translation with commentary by Cyril Mango and Roger Scott, *The Chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- Vaggione, Richard. *Eunomius: Extant Works*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Wickham, Lionel R. “The Syntagmation of Aetius,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968), 532–569.

SECONDARY WORKS

- Amacker, René and Eric Junod (eds.). *Apologie pour Origène*, *Sources Chrétiennes*, 464–465. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2002.
- Ayers, Lewis and Gareth Jones (eds.). *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric, and Community*. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Baldwin, B. “Greek Historiography in Late Rome and Early Byzantium,” *Hellenika* 33: 51–65.
- Bardy, Gustave. *Paul de Samosate*. Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Études et Documents, 1929.
- . *Recherches sur Saint Lucien d'Antioche et son École*. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et ses fils, 1936.
- . “Aux origines de l'école d'Alexandrie,” *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 27 (1937), 65–90.
- . *Histoire ecclésiastique: texte grec, traduction et annotation*, *Sources Chrétienennes*, Vols. 31, 41, 55, 73. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1952–60.
- Barnes, Michel R., and Daniel H. Williams (eds.). *Arianism After Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Barnes, Michel R. “The Fourth Century as Trinitarian Canon,” *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric, and Community*, 47–67. Lewis Ayres and Gareth Jones, eds. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Barnes, Timothy D. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- . *Tertullian: a Literary and Historical Study*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- . *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Battifol, P. *Quaestiones Philostorgianaæ*. Paris: Lahure, 1891.
- . “Un historiographe anonyme arien du IV siècle,” *Römische Quartalschrift* 9 (1895), 57–97.
- Biernert, Wolfgang A. *Dionysius von Alexandrien: zur Frage des Origenismus im dritten Jahrhundert*. New York: de Gruyter, 1978.

- Le Boulluec, Alain. *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque (II–III siècles)*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985.
- . “L’école d’Alexandrie: de quelques aventures d’un concept historiographique,” *Mélanges offerts au Père Claude Mondésert*, 403–417. Christian Decobert, ed. Le Caire: Institut français d’archéologie orientale, 1992.
- Brakke, David. *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- Brennecke, Hans Christof. *Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II: Untersuchungen zur dritten Phase des Arianischen Streites (337–361)*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984.
- . “Lucian von Antiochien,” *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 21 (1991), 474–479.
- . “Lukian von Antiochien in der Geschichte des arianischen Streites,” *Logos: Festschrift für Luise Abramowski zum 8. Juli 1993*, 170–192. Hans C. Brennecke and Ernst Ludwig, eds. New York: De Gruyter, 1993.
- Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- . *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.
- Burrus, Virginia. “The Heretical Woman as Symbol in Alexander, Athanasius, Epiphanius, and Jerome,” *Harvard Theological Review* 84 (1991), 229–248.
- . *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Butterworth, G.W., trans. *Origen: On First Principles*. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1973.
- Cameron, Averil. “Eusebius of Caesarea and the Rethinking of History,” *Tria Corda: Scritti di Arnaldo Momigliano*, ed. E. Gabba. Como: Edizioni New Press, 1983.
- Cameron, Ron. “Alternative Beginnings—Different Ends: Eusebius, Thomas, and the Construction of Christian Origins,” *Religious Propaganda and Missionary Competition in the New Testament World: Essays Honoring Dieter Georgi*, 501–525. Lukas Borman, Kelly del Tredici, and Angela Standhartinger, eds. New York: Brill, 1994.
- Chestnut, Glenn. “The Date and Composition of Theodoret’s Church History,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 35: 245–252.
- . *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1986.
- . “Eusebius, Augustine, Orosius, and the Later Patristic and Medieval Christian Historians,” *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, 687–713. Harold W. Attridge and Gohei Hata, eds. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- Clark, Elizabeth. *The Origenist Controversy: the Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Clarke, Graeme (ed.). *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay, Australia: Australian National University Press, 1990.
- Conybeare, F.C. “A Collation of the History of Socrates Scholasticus,” *Journal of Philology* 34: 47–77.
- . “Emendations of the Text of Socrates Scholasticus,” *Journal of Philology* 33: 208–237.
- Cox, Patricia. *Biography in Late Antiquity: a Quest for the Holy Man*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Croke, Brian, and Alanna M. Emmett (eds.). *History and Historians in Late Antiquity*. New York: Pergamon, 1983.
- Dechow, Jon. *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius and the Legacy of Origen*. Macon, GA: North American Patristic Society Monograph Series, 1988.
- Declerck, José (ed.). *Eustathii Antiocheni: Opera*. Leuven: University Press, 2002.
- Downey, G. “The Perspective of Early Church Historians,” *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 6: 57–70.
- Drake, Hal. *Constantine and the Bishops: the Politics of Intolerance*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2000.

- Elm, Susanna. "The dog that did not bark: doctrine and patriarchal authority in the conflict between Theophilus of Alexandria and John Chrysostom of Constantinople," *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric, and Community*, 68–93. Lewis Ayres and Gareth Jones, eds. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Elm, Susanna, Eric Rebillard, and Antonella Romano (eds.). *Virgins of God: The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- . *Orthodoxie, Christianisme, histoire*. Collection de l'École française de Rome, no. 270. Rome: École française, 2000.
- Ferguson, Thomas C. "The Enthrall Heretical Power: History and Heresy in John Henry Newman," *Anglican Theological Review* 85 (2003), 641–662.
- . "The Past is Prologue: Origenism in Book X of the *Ecclesiastical History*," *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 7 (2003), 99–112.
- Fowden, Garth. "The Last Days of Constantine: Oppositional Versions and their Influence," *Journal of Roman Studies* 84 (1994), 146–170.
- Frede, Michael. "Eusebius' Apologetic Writings," *Apologetic in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*, 223–250. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price, eds. Oxford: University Press, 1999.
- Gamble, Harry. *Books and Readers in the Early Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).
- Geppert, Franz. *Die Quellen des Kirchenhistorikers Socrates Scholasticus*. Naumburg: Lippert & Co., 1898.
- Glas, Anton. *Die Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisarea*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1914.
- Grant, Robert M. *Eusebius as Church Historian*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980.
- Greer, Rowan A. *Origen*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1979.
- Gregg, Robert C., ed. *Arianism: Historical and Theological Assessments*. Cambridge, MA: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1985.
- Gregg, Robert C., and Dennis E. Groh. "The Centrality of Soteriology in Early Arianism," *Anglican Theological Review* 59 (1977), 260–278.
- . *Early Arianism: A View of Salvation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- Gustafsson, B. "Eusebius' Principles in Handling His Sources," *Texte und Untersuchungen* 79: 429–441.
- Gutzman, K.R. Constantine. "Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea and his 'Life of Constantine': a Heretic's Legacy," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 42 (1997), 351–358.
- Gwatkin, Henry M. *Studies of Arianism*. Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1900.
- Hanson, R.P.C. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- Harl, Marguerite (ed.). *Sur les Écritures: Philocalie 1–20. Sources Chrétien*nes, 302. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1983.
- Harries, Jill. "Patristic Historiography," *Early Christianity: Origins and Evolution to AD 600*, 269–279. Ian Hazlett, ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 1991.
- Henry, Réne. *Photius: Bibliothèque*. Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 1960.
- Holdsworth, Christopher, and T.P. Wiseman (eds.). *The Inheritance of Historiography, 350–900*. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1986.
- Hollerich, Michael J. *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary on Isaiah: Christian exegesis in the Age of Constantine*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Jones, A.H.M. *The Later Roman Empire, 284–602*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.
- Junod, Eric (ed.). *Sur le libre arbitre: Philocalie 21–27. Sources Chrétien*nes, 226. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1976.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. *Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology: the Arian Crisis*. Berkeley: Colloquy/The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, the GTU and the University of California, 1982.
- . "Arius and the Arians," *Theological Studies* 44 (1983), 456–475.
- . "Eusebius of Caesarea, Origenist," *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism*, 435–466. Harold W. Attridge and Gohei Hata, eds. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.

- Kinzig, Wolfram. *In Search of Asterius: Studies on the Authorship of the Homilies of the Psalms*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Kopecek, Thomas A. *A History of Neo-Arianism*. Cambridge, MA: Philadelphia Patristics Foundation, 1979.
- Lang, U.M. "The Christological Controversy at the Synod of Antioch in 268/269," *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS, Vol. 51 (2000), 54–80.
- Laqueur, Richard A. *Eusebius als Historiker seiner Zeit*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1929.
- Lienhard, Joseph. "The Arian Controversy: Some Categories Reconsidered," *Theological Studies* 48 (1987), 415–437.
- . *Contra Marcellum: Marcellus of Ancyra and Fourth Century Theology*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2000.
- Lightfoot, J.B. "Eusebius of Caesarea," *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 308–348. London: 1880.
- Lim, Richard. *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Lohr, Winrich. "A Sense of Tradition: the Homoiousian Church Party," *Arianism after Arius*, 81–100.
- Luibhéid, Colm. *Eusebius of Caesarea and the Arian Crisis*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1981.
- Lyman, J. Rebecca. *Christology and Cosmology: Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius*. New York: Oxford, 1993.
- . "The Making of a Heretic: the Life of Origen in Epiphanius *Panarion* 64," *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997), 446–451. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- . "A Topography of Heresy: Mapping the Rhetorical Creation of Arianism," *Arianism after Arius*, 45–62.
- . "Origen as Ascetic Theologian: Orthodoxy and Authority in the Fourth Century Church," *Origeniana Septima: Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts*, 187–194. W.A. Bienert and U. Kühneweg, eds. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- . "Ascetics and Bishops: Epiphanius on Orthodoxy," *Orthodoxy, Christianity, History*, 149–161. Susanna Elm, Éric Rebillard, and Antonella Romano, eds. Rome: École Française de Rome, 2000.
- Mack, Burton. *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Maraval, Pierre. *Le Christianisme de Constantin à la Conquête Arabe*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1997.
- Maraval, Pierre and Pierre Pérignon (eds.). Socrate de Constantinople, *Histoire ecclésiastique*. Livre I. *Sources Chrétiennes*, 477. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 2004.
- Markus, Robert A. "Church History and the Early Church Historians," *Studies in Church History* 11: 1–17.
- Martin, Annick. *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'église d'Egypte au IV^e siècle (328–373)*. Rome: École française de Rome, 1996.
- Meredith, Anthony. *The Cappadocians*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995.
- Millar, Fergus. "Paul of Samosata, Zenobia, and Aurelian: the Church, Local Culture, and the Political Allegiance in Third-Century Syria," *Journal of Religious Studies* 61 (1971), 1–17.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. *The Conflict Between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1964.
- . *On Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1987.
- Murphy, Francis X. *Rufinus of Aquileia: His Life and Works*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1945.
- Nautin, Pierre. *Origène: sa vie et son oeuvre*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1977.
- Nobbs, Alanna M. "Philostorgius' Ecclesiastical History: An 'Alternative Ideology,'" *Tyndale Bulletin* 42 (1991), 271–281.

- Oulton, J.L. "Rufinus' Translation of the Church History of Eusebius," *Journal of Theological Studies* 30: 150–174.
- Patterson, Lloyd. *Methodius of Olympus: Divine Sovereignty, Human Freedom, and Life in Christ*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1997.
- Peeters, Paul. "La Légende de Saint Jacques de Nisibe," *Analecta Bollandiana* 38 (1920), 285–373.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Christianity and Classical Culture: The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Pharr, Clyde. *The Theodosian Code and Novels, and the Sirmondian Constitutions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952.
- Pietri, Luce (ed.). *Histoire du christianisme, Volume 1: Le Nouveau peuple (des origines à 250)*. Paris: Desclée, 2000.
- Pouderon, Bernard and Yves-Marie Duval (eds.). *L'historiographie de l'Église des Premiers Siècles*. Paris: Beauchesne, 2001.
- Pourkier, Aline. *L'hérésiologie chez Épiphane de Salamine*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1992.
- Radford, L.B. *Three Teachers of Alexandria: Theognostus, Pierius, and Peter. A Study in the Early History of Origenism and anti-Origenism*. Cambridge: University Press, 1908.
- Rankin, David. *Tertullian and the Church*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- de Riedmatten, Henri. *Les actes du procès de Paul de Samosate: étude sur la christologie du III^e–IV^e siècles*. Fribourg: Editions St. Paul, 1952.
- Robeck, Cecil. *Prophecy in Carthage: Perpetua, Tertullian, and Cyprian*. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 1992.
- Rousseau, Philip. "Christian Asceticism and the Early Monks," in *Early Christianity: Origins and Evolutions to AD 600*, 112–122. Ian Hazlett, ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 1991.
- . *Basil of Caesarea*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Rupp, Joseph. *Cyrilli Opera*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1967.
- Sample, Robert Lynn. *The Messiah as Prophet: the Christology of Paul of Samosata*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1977.
- Sage, Michael. *Cyprian*. Cambridge, MA: Philadelphia Patristic Monograph Series, No. 1, 1975.
- Schamp, J. "The Lost Church History of Gelasius of Caesarea," *Patristic and Byzantine Review* 6: 146–152.
- Scherer, J. *Entretien d'Origène avec Héraclide*, Sources Chrétiennes, 67. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1960.
- Simonetti, Manilo. *La Crisi Ariana nel Quarto Secolo*. Rome: Institutum Augustinianum, 1975.
- Skedros, James C. *Saint Demetrios of Thessaloniki: Civic Patron and Divine Protector, 4th–7th centuries CE*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- Smulders, Pieter (ed.). *Hilary of Poitiers' Preface to his Opus historicum*. New York: Brill, 1995.
- Snee, R. "Valens' Recall of the Nicene Exiles and Anti-Arian Propaganda," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 26: 395–419.
- Stead, Christopher. "Arius in Modern Research," *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1994), 24–36.
- Thélamon, Françoise. "L'Empereur idéal d'après 'Histoire Ecclésiastique de Rufin d'Aquilée,'" *Studia Patristica* 10: 310–314.
- . *Païens et Chrétiens au IV^e siècle: L'apport de l'*'Histoire ecclésiastique'* de Rufin d'Aquilée*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1981.
- Ulrich, Jorg. *Euseb von Caesarea und die Juden: Studien zur Rolle der Juden in der Theologie des Eusebius von Caesarea* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999).
- Urbainczyk, Theresa. *Socrates of Constantinople: Historian of Church and State*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.

- Vaggione, Richard. “‘Arius, Heresy, and Tradition’ by Rowan Williams; also Gregg and Groh’s ‘Early Arianism,’ and Rudolph Lorenz’ ‘Arius judaizans?’,” *Toronto Journal of Theology* 5 (1989), 63–87.
- . *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*. New York: Oxford, 2001.
- Van Dam, Raymond. “Emperors, Bishops, and Friends in Late Antique Cappadocia,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 37 (1986), 53–76.
- . *Becoming Christian: the Conversion of Roman Cappadocia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- . *Families and Friends in Late Roman Cappadocia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- Van den Hoek, Annewies. “The ‘Catechetical’ School of Early Christian Alexandria and Its Philonic Heritage,” *Harvard Theological Review* 90 (1997), 59–87.
- Villain, Maurice. “Rufin d’Aquilée et l’Histoire Ecclésiastique,” *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 33 (1946), 164–209.
- Vinzent, Markus. *Asterius von Kappadokien: die theologischen Fragmente: Einleitung, kritischer Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. New York: Brill, 1993.
- Vivian, Tim. *St. Peter of Alexandria: Bishop and Martyr* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988).
- Wallace-Hadrill, D.S. *Eusebius of Caesarea*. London, A.R. Mowbray, 1960.
- . “Attitudes to Arius in the Arian Controversy,” *Arianism after Arius*, 31–44.
- . “In Defence of Arius,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1963), 339–347.
- . *Archetypal Heresy: Arianism Through the Centuries*. New York: Oxford, 1996.
- Williams, D.H. “A Reassessment of the Early Career and Exile of Hilary of Poitiers,” in Everett Ferguson (ed.), *History, Hope, Human Language, and Christian Reality: Recent Studies in the History of Christianity, Vol. 6*. New York: Garland, 1999.
- Williams, Rowan. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition*. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1987.
- . (ed.). *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Winkelmann, F. “Charakter und Bedeutung der Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia,” *Byz. Forsch.* 1: 346–385.
- Young, Frances. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: a Guide to the Literature and Background*. London: SCM Press, 1983.

FRAGMENTS FROM A NON-NICENE CHRONICLER

INTRODUCTION TO THE TEXT

This book focuses on the works of three authors: the *Ecclesiastical Histories* of Eusebius, texts written by a non-Nicene Chronicler, Rufinus, and the writings of Philostorgius. Of these works, those of the non-Nicene chronicler and Philostorgius' *Ecclesiastical History* are probably the least familiar, though the Greek text of Photius' epitome has appeared previously in a scholarly edition.¹ The fragments of the non-Nicene Chronicler have only appeared as compiled by Joseph Bidez in his 1913 critical edition of Philostorgius' *Ecclesiastical History*. When compiling the text of Philostorgius, Bidez also included several other texts that demonstrated non-Nicene sources. These texts included the *Vita* of Lucian of Antioch, claimed as an authoritative teacher by some non-Nicene traditions, and the martyrdom of Artemius, as well as fragments by the non-Nicene chronicler.

Bidez' reconstruction of the non-Nicene² chronicler in turn leans heavily on two Byzantine chronicles: the *Chronicon Pascale* and the *Chronicle* of Theophanes the Confessor. It has long been recognized that there were non-Nicene emphases in, and perhaps even non-Nicene sources for, these two chronicles. Theophanes the Confessor himself substantially reworked sections of the *CP* which he felt showed undue “Arian” influence.³ Given that the *CP* and Theophanes reveal numerous similarities, particularly with regard to non-Nicene material, one needs to ask what kind of source material the two chroniclers were using. In the introduction to their translation of the *CP*, Whitby and Whitby propose that the Byzantine chroniclers Malalas and Theophanes were drawing from a common source, perhaps the *CP*, for their non-Nicene material.⁴ It is more likely, however, that

¹ René Henry, trans. and ed., *Bibliothèque* (Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles lettres, 1959–1991).

² The term Bidez uses is “Arian,” (“Fragmente eines arianischen Historiographen”) but in keeping with my hermeneutic that this term is increasingly unhelpful, I have continued to use the descriptor “non-Nicene.”

³ This can be seen, for instance, in Theophanes’ discussion of the baptism of Constantine.

⁴ Whitby and Whitby, xv.

there was a common body of non-Nicene historical materials available to Theophanes, Malalas, and the compiler of the *CP*.⁵ In their introduction to Theophanes' *Chronicle*, Mango and Scott are in general agreement with this hypothesis. They dispute that the *CP* could have been a source for Theophanes, noting that it was not readily available in Constantinople around the year 800 when Theophanes was writing—for example, there is no mention of it in Photius' *Bibliotheca* nor does it appear to have been a source for other texts produced at that time, such as Nicephoras' *Short History*.⁶ Thus it would seem that Theophanes accessed the non-Nicene material either through a single hypothetical chronicle that served as a common source (which the authors refer to as Hypoth. Arian) or from other available sources containing the same material.

Another issue which needs to be addressed is how Theophanes and the *CP* treat their common source material. By comparing the *CP* to other extant material, Whitby and Whitby conclude that the compiler was more or less faithful in reproducing sources, and therefore conclude that the chronicler would perhaps be equally faithful in reproducing non-Nicene materials. Yet Whitby and Whitby also caution that “it would be wrong to assume that an origin can, or should, be found for every word: the author was prepared on occasions to think about his material and to adapt it, not necessarily correctly, when he saw fit.”⁷ Mango and Scott likewise assert that Theophanes was relatively faithful in reproducing his sources, noting that the *Chronicle* is a “file” of more than twenty different sources. Despite this, Theophanes is not without his editorial issues—he at times corrects the non-Nicene source material where he thinks it to be erroneous, and the *Chronicle* contains various doublets and variant place and personal names due to the numerous sources. The question remains, however, as to whether the *CP* and Theophanes were accessing these non-Nicene materials directly or through various intermediaries. It is most likely impossible to determine this, and, moreover, is not so important for the purposes of this work: the mere existence of a non-Nicene historical tradition is far more important for the issues which are raised in this book. This issue is addressed

⁵ Whitby and Whitby, xvi, especially footnote 26.

⁶ Mango and Scott, liii–liv.

⁷ Whitby and Whitby, xx.

in Chapter 3, which focuses on how non-Nicene communities began to construct historical narratives of communal identity.

The two Byzantine chronicles mentioned above are the sources for the bulk of Bidez' reconstruction of the non-Nicene chronicle: of the 48 fragments Bidez identifies, forty-five contain references to Theophanes and twenty contain references to the *CP*. Also significant is the Byzantine *Chronicle* 724 (twenty references), the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian (fourteen references), and Jerome's Chronicle (eighteen references), though these citations contain very few longer narrative sections like those preserved in the two main Byzantine chronicles.

The text is reproduced from Joseph Bidez, *Philostorgius' Kirchengeschichte*, 202–241.

VII.

FRAGMENTE
EINES ARIANISCHEN HISTORIOGRAPHEN.

VERZEICHNIS DER ABKÜRZUNGEN

- Chron. P. = Chronicon Paschale rec. L. Dindorfius, vol. I Bonnae 1832 [Cod. V = Vaticanus gr. 1941].
Theophan. = Theophanis Chronographia rec. C. de Boor, vol. I Lipsiae 1883 [Codd.: b — cd — efm — gh; x = cd; y = efm; z = gh; A = Anastasii versio latina].
Hier. Chron. = Hieronymi Chronicon [Text nach den Collationen des H. Prof. R. Helm controlliert].
Chron. M. = Chronicon miscellaneum [oder Liber Calipharum] ad a. D. 724 pertinens ed. E.-W. Brooks, Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium cur. J.-B. Chabot, I. Guidi usw. Scriptores Syri Versio series tertia, tomus IV pars secunda III.
Jak. Edess. = Chronicon Iacobi Edesseni ed. E.-W. Brooks, ebd., pars tertia II.
Chron. CE. = Chronicon civile et ecclesiasticum anonymi auctoris ed. I. E. II Rahmani Scharfeh (Libanon) 1904.
Michael = Chronique de Michel le Syrien éd. par J.-B. Chabot, tome premier, fascicule II Paris 1900.
-

Die Übersetzung der syrischen Texte ist von Prof. M.-A. Kugener verfaßt oder revidiert.

1 — a. 253 S. 503, 15: Κατὰ διαδοχὴν δὲ ἥλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦτο Chron. P. περὶ τοῦ ἀγίου Βαβυλᾶ, ὃς διηγήσατο τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν ὁ μακάριος Λεόντιος, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Ἀντιοχείας.

»Οὗτος Δέκιος ἀνεῖλε τὸν ἄγιον Βαβυλᾶν, οὐχ ὡς Χριστιανὸν 5 μόνον, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι καὶ ἐτόλμησεν ἐπισχεῖν τοῦ βασιλέως Φιλίππου τὴν γυναικα καὶ αὐτὸν Φίλιππον, Χριστιανὸν δόντας, εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, παρανομήσαντος τοῦ Φιλίππου. ἦν δὲ ἡ παρανομία τοιαύτη· Φίλιππος ἔκεινος ὁ Ἰούνωρ, ἔπαρχος ὅν ἐπὶ τοῦ προηγησαμένου αὐτὸν βασιλέως Γορδιανοῦ, παραθήκην ἔλαβεν παρὰ Γορδιανοῦ τὸν 10 νιὸν αὐτοῦ. καὶ τελευτήσαντος Γορδιανοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως σφάξας τὸν παῖδα Φίλιππος ἔβασίλευσεν.«

2 — a. 303 S. 515, 14: Τῷ αὐτῷ ἔτει πολλοὶ μὲν πανταχόσε, καθὼς ἔφαμεν, διαθλήσαντες ἐτελειώθησαν, οὐδὲν δὲ ἦτον καὶ κατὰ τὴν Νικομηδέων πόλιν, ἐν ᾧ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διατριβὰς τότε, 15 Δωρόθεος καὶ Γοργόνιος σὺν ἑτέροις ἄμα πλείσι τῆς βασιλικῆς ὑπηρεσίας οὖσιν ἐτελειώθησαν, καὶ χορὸς ἄμα πολὺς μαρτύρων ἀνεδείχθη. οὐ μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ καὶ "Ανθιμος, τῆς αὐτῆς Νικομηδέων ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπος, τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθεὶς ἐτελειώθη· ἔτεροι δὲ πυρί, πλείονες δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ ἐρίπτοντο, οὐκ εὐτονούντων τῶν 20 δημίων εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀπειρότατον πλῆθος ἔξαρκειν.

Περὶ τούτου τοῦ ἀπείρου πλήθους τῶν μαρτυρησάντων Λουκιανὸς πρεσβύτερος Ἀντιοχεῦσι γράφων ἐδήλου·

»Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς χορὸς ἄπας ὁμοῦ μαρτύρων. εὐαγγελίζομαι δὲ >ὑμᾶς ὡς "Ανθιμος ὁ πάπας τῷ τοῦ μαρτυρίου δρόμῳ ἐτελειώθη.«

25 Καὶ τὰ μὲν κατὰ Νικομήδειαν ταῦτα, καὶ τούτων ἔτι πλείονα.

4—11 vgl. Philostorg. VII 8 ob. S. 89, 3 u. 17. Hieronym. De viris illustr. 54 u. 62 — **5 ff** vgl. Joh. Chrys. De S. Babyla c. Julian. 5 f. Euseb. H. E. VI 34 — **12—20** vgl. Euseb. H. E. VIII 6 — **17 ff** vgl. ob. S. 188, 19 ff u. 196, 15 f

2 διηγήσατο τοῖς Rader διηγήσατοισ sic V | **4** οὗτος Rader οὕτωσ V | βαβυλὰν V | 8 ιούνωρ V Ιουνίωρ Rader | **9** ἔλαβεν, ev durch Corr., V | **12** ἔτη V, u. so oft | **14** nach τότε interpongiert V^c | **15** πλείωσι V | **16** χορὸς V | **17** u. **24** ἀνθημος V | **20** ἀπειρότατον V | **24** δρόμῳ, ρ durch Corr., V | **25** ἔτη V, u. so oft

Chron. p. 3 — a. 325 S. 526, 1: Κατ' αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν καιρὸν κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστεως στρατεύσας ὑπηγάγετο (näml. ὁ Κωνσταντῖνος) τῇ εὐχῇ τὴν νίκην. διὸ καὶ κυριακὰ πρὸς ἐπιστροφὴν τῶν ἔθνῶν κατὰ τόπους εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν πεποίηκεν.

Theophan. 3^a — S. 20, 17: "Οθεν καὶ κατὰ πάντων τῶν πολεμίων ὑπηγάγετο τῇ εὐχῇ τὴν νίκην. διὸ καὶ κυριακὰ πρὸς ἐπιστροφὴν τῶν ἔθνῶν κατὰ τόπους εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πεποίηκεν.

10 Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5815) καὶ Μαρτῖνος ἐσφάγη τυραννήσας μῆνας τρεῖς. καὶ Λικινιανός, ὁ νιὸς Λικινίου, Καῖσαρ ἀπεδύθη ὑπὸ 10 Κωνσταντίνου.

15 Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει Ναρσῆς, ὁ νιὸς τοῦ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλέως, κατέδραμε τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν καὶ λαμβάνει πόλιν Ἀμιδαν. τούτῳ Κωνστάντιος ὁ Καῖσαρ, Κωνσταντίνου παῖς, πολεμεῖ καὶ πταίσας ὄλιγα τέλος οὗτῳ τῆς μάχης ἐκράτησεν, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸν ἀνελεῖν τὸν Ναρσῆν.

7 τῶν ἔθνῶν > ed. | 10 ὁ nach Λικινίου ~ gxy | 12 νάρσης b |
13 ἀμίδαν b ἀμηδαν g | 15 ὄλιγον gxy | 16 νάρσην b

Chron. M. 3^b — S. 101, 4: Constantinus clementissimus adversus eos qui im- 20 pugnabant religionem Christianorum se paravit et obtinuit τὴν νίκην τῇ εὐχῇ a deo. et διὸ καὶ ecclesias πρὸς ἐπιστροφὴν Christianorum omni loco εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ θεοῦ condidit.

Subiecti sunt ei reges et populi barbarorum.

25 S. 102, 21: Et anno duodecimo sui regni bellum gessit adversus Licinium [Lbinos Cod.] eumque vicit et eius regnum occupavit. anno sequenti rebellavit adversus eum Martinus, qui regnavit tres menses et occisus est. et obtinuit universum imperium Romanorum Constantinus cum suis filiis Constantino, Constantio et Constante, anno undecimo pacis ecclesiis concessae.

25 f vgl. Jak. Edess. 199 Anm. Michael 202, 8f 13f u. 239, 19 ff

4 — a. 327 S. 527, 9: Δρέπαναν ἐπικτίσας ὁ βασιλεὺς Κωνσταντῖνος Chron. P.
ἐν Βιθυνίᾳ εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ ἀγίου μάρτυρος Λουκιανοῦ ὄμώνυμον τῇ
μητρὶ αὐτοῦ Ἐλενούπολιν κέκληκεν, δωρησάμενος ἔχρι τοῦ νῦν ἔως
φανερᾶς περιοχῆς πρὸ τῆς πόλεως εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ ἀγίου μάρτυρος

5 Λουκιανοῦ ἀτέλειαν.

[5 fehlt]

6 — a. 328 S. 527, 16: Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ εὐσεβὴς τὸν Δανούβην πλει-
στάκις ἐπέρασεν καὶ γέφυραν αὐτῷ λιθίνην ἐποίησεν.

1—5 vgl. Philostorg. II 12 u. Anhang VI ob. S. 201, 4 ff

10 1 δρέπαναν V, vgl. unt. Z. 17, 26 u. 33 | κωνσταντῖνος V, u. so oft |
2 nach Βιθυνίᾳ + ἐπικτήσας ausradiert V | ὄμώνυμον V | 3 ἐλε-νούπολιν V,
aber vgl. unt. Z. 18, 27 f u. 35

4^a — S. 27, 31: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5818) Κωνσταντῖνος νικητὴς Theophan.
εὐσεβέστατος κατὰ Γερμανῶν καὶ Σαρματῶν καὶ Γότθων στρατεύσας
15 νίκην ἥρατο κραταιὰν διὰ τῆς τοῦ σταυροῦ δυνάμεως, καὶ τούτους
ἔρημάσας εἰς ἐσχάτην αὐτοὺς κατήγαγε δουλείαν.

Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει καὶ Δρεπάναν ἐπικτίσας εἰς τιμὴν Λουκιανοῦ
τοῦ ἐκεῖσε μάρτυρος ὄμώνυμον τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ Ἐλενόπολιν κέκληκεν

5 — S. 28, 16: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5819) ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τὸ ὄ-
20 κτάγωνον κυριακὸν ἥρξατο οἰκοδομεῖσθαι.

6^a — S. 28, 19: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5820) Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ εὐ-
σεβὴς τὸν Δανούβιν περάσας γέφυραν ἐν αὐτῷ λιθίνην πεποίηκε καὶ
τοὺς Σκύθας ὑπέταξεν.

17 καὶ > dy | δρεπάναν b δρεπάναν fg δρεπάναν dem δρεπανα sic c |
25 18 ἐκεῖσε > g | 22 δανούβην c δανούβιν die übr. HSS

4^b — S. 101, 9: Et Drepanam ἐπέκτισεν εἰς τιμὴν Luciani μάρτυρος, Chron. M.
qui ἐκεῖσε depositus erat, et de nomine μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Helenae Helena-
polim κέκληκεν eam.

5^a — Ebd. Folge: Antiochiae ecclesiam magnam φωδόμησεν.

30 5^b—6^b — S. 259, 23: Et φωδόμησεν Antiochiae templum ὡκτά- Michael
γωνον et ἐποίησε γέφυραν ἐν (wörtlich super) flumine Danubio, et
traiecerunt exercitus eius, καὶ Scythes ὑπέταξεν et ad fidem adduxit.

4^c — a. Abr. 2343: Drepanam Bithyniae civitatem in honorem mar-
tyris Luciani ibi conditi Constantinus instaurans ex vocabulo matris
35 suae Helenopolin nuncupavit. Hier. Chron.

5^e — Ebd. Folge: In Antiochia dominicum quod vocatur aureum
aedificari coeptum.

Chron. P. 7 — a. 330 S. 529, 11: "Ετους τα' τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀναλήψεως τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κε' τῆς ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείας Κωνσταντίνος ὁ εὐσεβέστατος, πατὴρ Κωνσταντίνου νέου Αύγούστου καὶ Κωνσταντίου καὶ Κώνσταντος Καισάρων, πόλιν μεγίστην, λαμπρὰν καὶ εὐδαίμονα κτίσας
 5 συγκλήτῳ τε τιμήσας, Κωνσταντινούπολιν κέκληκε πρὸ πέντε ιδῶν Μαΐων ἡμέρᾳ δευτέρᾳ τῆς ἔβδομαδος, ἵνδικτιώνος τρίτης, τὸ πρότερον καλούμενην Βυζάντιον, Ῥώμην αὐτὴν δευτέραν χρηματίζειν ἀναγορεύσας.

5/6 πρὸ — Μαΐων = Chron. min. ed. Mommsen I 233 a. 330 | **6 ἵνδικτιόνος** V

Theophan. 7^a — S. 28, 23: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5821) κτίζων Κωνσταντῖνος
 11 ὁ εὐσεβὴς τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν Ῥώμην νέαν χρηματίζειν ταύτην ἐθέσπισε καὶ σύγκλητον ἔχειν ἐκέλευσεν, στήσας καὶ πορφυροῦν κίονα καὶ ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ ἀνδριάντα ἑαυτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ τόπου, οὗ ἦρξατο οἰκοδομεῖν τὴν πόλιν, ἐπὶ τὸ δυτικὸν μέρος τῆς ἐπὶ Ῥώμην ἔξιούσης
 15 πύλης, κοσμήσας τὴν πόλιν καὶ κομίσας ἐν αὐτῇ ἀπὸ πάσης ἐπαρχίας καὶ πόλεως, εἴ τι ἔργον ἦν εὐκοσμίας καὶ ἀνδριάντων καὶ χαλκοῦ καὶ μαρμάρου.

8 — S. 28, 32: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5822) ἐπέτεινε Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ εὐσεβὴς τὴν κατὰ τῶν εἰδώλων καὶ τῶν ναῶν αὐτῶν κατάλυσιν,
 20 καὶ κατὰ τόπους ἡφανίζοντο· καὶ αἱ πρόσοδοι αὐτῶν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεδίδοντο.

10—17 vgl. Philostorg. II 9 u. 9^a — **18 ff** vgl. ob. S. 154, 22f. Malalas 317, 9.
 Chron. P. 525, 19 — **20 f** vgl. Theophan. 24, 4. Philostorg. ob. S. 82, 11 f

Chron. M. 7^b u. 8^a — Ebd. Folge: Et propter suum amorem dei memoria idolorum delevit fanaque eorum evertit.

Episcopus Hierosolymorum XXXX^{us} Maximus. episcopus Alexandriae XVIII^{us} Athanasius. episcopus Antiochiae..... et post eum XXV^{us}

Eusebius, filius Pamphili, episcopus Caesareae Palaestinae, scriptor innotuit, cuius etiam multi libri asservantur.

30 Constantinus πόλιν famosam et εὐδαίμονα ἔκτισεν, et συγκλήτῳ (*im Syr.*) ἐτίμησεν eam, quam et Constantinopolim κέκληκε, quae τὸ πρότερον Byzantia ἐκαλεῖτο.

27 nach *Antiochiae* u. *XXV^{us}* Raum leer gelassen in der HS; vgl. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2345

Hier. Chron. 7^c u. 8^b — a. Abr. 2346: Dedicatur Constantinopolis omnium paene urbium nuditate.

a. Abr. 2347: Edicto Constantini gentilium templorum subversa sunt.

11–12 — a. 335 S. 531, 14: Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς ἥχθη Chron. P.
τριακονταετηρὶς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ῥώμῃ πάνυ φιλοτίμως . . .
καὶ Δαλματιον τὸν νὺὸν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ Δαλματίου τοῦ κήνσωρος
Καίσαρα ἀνηγόρευσεν. [das übrige viell. desselben Ursprungs]

5 **1** f vgl. Chronic. min. ed. Mommsen I 235 a. 335. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2351

3 κήνσωρος Dindorf κήναρος, ρ durch Corr., V

9 — S. 29, 11: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5823) ἡ ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ βασι- Theophan.
λικὴ πυρὶ θείῳ κατεφλέχθη.

10 — S. 29, 13: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5824), μελλούσης τῆς ἑβδό-
μης ἵνδικτιῶνος ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι, λιμὸς ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ
ἐπικρατήσας σφοδρότερον, ὥστε κώμας κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸν ὅχλῳ πολλῷ
συναγομένας ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας Ἀντιοχέων καὶ τῆς Κύρου ἐπέρχεσθαι
κατ' ἀλλήλων καὶ ἀρπάζειν μὲν ὡς ἐν νυκτὶ ταῖς ἐφόδοις, ἔσχατον
δὲ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπεισιέναι εἰς τὸν σιτοβολῶνας καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀποθήκαις
15 κοὶ πάντα πραιδεύοντας ἀρπάζειν καὶ ἀναχωρεῖν, γενέσθαι δὲ τὸν
μόδιον τοῦ σίτου υἱὸντας. ὁ δὲ μέγας Κωνσταντῖνος σιτομέτριον
ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις κατὰ πόλιν ἐχαρίσατο εἰς διατροφὴν διηνεκῶς χήραις
κοὶ ξενοδοχείοις πένησι τε καὶ τοῖς κληρικοῖς. ἡ δὲ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ
ἐκκλησία ἐλάμβανε σίτου μοδίους τρισμυρίους ἔξακισχιλίους. τῷ δ'
20 αὐτῷ ἔτει σεισμοῦ λαβροτάτου γενομένου ἐν Κύπρῳ, Σαλαμίνα πόλις
κατέπεσε καὶ ἰκανὴν πληθὺν διέφθειρεν.

11^a — S. 29, 28: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5825) Δαλμάτιος Καίσαρα ἀνη-
γορεύθη. Καλόκαιρος δὲ ἐν Κύπρῳ τῇ νήσῳ τυραννήσας οὐκ ἀντέσχε
τῇ Ῥωμαίων προσβολῇ· καὶ ἡττηθεὶς ἄμα τοῖς αἰτίοις ἀνηρέθη ἐν
25 Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας καυθεὶς ζῶν ὑπὸ Δαλματίου Καίσαρος.

12^a — S. 29, 36: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5826) Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ εὐ-
σεβεστάτου καὶ νικητοῦ ἥχθη τριακονταετηρὶς πάνυ φιλοτίμως. καὶ

20 σαλαμίνα b σαλαμίνη ex σαλαμήνη fm σαλμίνη g | **23** καλόκερος cy

10^a — S. 259, 26: Et cum ἐγένετο λιμὸς ille magnus in regionibus Michael
30 Ἀνατολῆς, iussit victor Constantinus ex suo dari cibum πένησι καὶ
κληρικοῖς, et dedit τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Antiochiae σίτου μοδίους τρισμυρίους
et ἔξακισχιλίους.

10^b — a. Abr. 2349: Pestilentia et fame innumerabilis multitudo in Hier. Chron.
Syria Ciliciaque perit.

35 11^b — a. Abr. 2350: Calocerus in Cypro res novas molitus opprimitur

Chron. P. 13 — a. 337 S. 532, 7: Πέρσαι πόλεμον ἐδήλωσαν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους· καὶ ἐπιβὰς Κωνσταντῖνος λβ' ἐνιαυτῷ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας, ὁρμήσας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀνατολὴν κατὰ Περσῶν, ἐλθὼν ἔως Νικομηδείας, ἐνδόξως καὶ εὐσεβῶς μεταλλάττει τὸν βίον ἐν προαστείῳ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως

5 **1 ff** vgl. Philostorg. II 16. Malalas 324, 5 — **4 ff** vgl. Euseb. V. C. IV 61

4 ἐν προαστείῳ vgl. Malalas 324, 6: ἐν προαστείῳ τινὶ λεγομένῳ Ἀχυρῶνι, Euseb. 1. 1. S. 143, 3; Sozomen. II 34, 1 u. unt. S. 209, 33

Theophan. ἐφάνη ἀστὴρ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐν οὐρανῷ κατὰ τὸ ἀνατολικὸν μέρος καπνίζων σφόδρα ὡς ἀπὸ καμίνου, ἀπὸ ὥρας τρίτης ἔως ὥρας
10 πέμπτης.

13^a — S. 33, 11: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5828) Εὐστάθιος, πρεσβύτερος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, ἀποστολικὸν βίον ἐπανηρημένος καὶ εἰς ἄκρον ἀρετῆς ἐληλακώς, διαπρέπων ἐγνωρίζετο, καὶ Ζηνόβιος ἀρχιτέκτων, ὁ τὸ Μαρτύριον ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις οἰκοδομήσας τῇ Κωνσταντίνου ἐπιταγῇ.

Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει πολλοὶ τῶν ἐν Πέρσαις Ἀσσυρίων ἐν Μεσοποταμίᾳ ὑπὸ Σαρακηνῶν ἐπιπράσκοντο.

Πέρσαι δὲ ἐδήλωσαν πόλεμον πρὸς Ῥωμαίους· καὶ ἐπιβὰς Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ εὐσεβῆς τῇ Νικομηδέων πόλει κατὰ Περσῶν παραταξά-
20 μενος, ἀσθενήσας ἐκοιμήθη ἐν εἰρήνῃ, ὡς τινές φασιν Ἀρειανόφρονες

18 ff vgl. Michael 260, 4 u. 9f — **20 ff** vgl. Theophan. 17, 28

18 πέρσαισ b | **19/20** ob παραταξόμενος? de Boor | **20 ff** vgl. Agapius de Menbidj Histoire universelle, übersetzt von Vasilief, Patrologia Orientalis VII fasc. 4 S. 564: »Quand il (näml. Constantin) fut sur le point de mourir, aucun de ses fils n'étant présent, il remit son testament entre les mains de l'évêque Eusèbe, attaché à la personne de l'empereur, et lui ordonna de le remettre à son fils Constantin [l. Constance; vgl. Michael 269, 8f; Socrat. I 39, 4 u. ob. S. 27 f].«

Chron. M. 13^b — S. 101, 27: Eustathius, πρεσβύτερος Constantinopolis, βίον
30 ἀποστολικὸν assumpserat, et Zenobius archidiaconus (*sic*) innotuit. et templum Hierosolymis φικοδόμησε prout praecepit Constantinus.

In Mesopotamia πολλοὶ τῶν in Perside Assyriorum a Tayyāyê (= Saracenis) venditi sunt.

Hier. Chron. 13^c — a. Abr. 2352: Eustathius Constantinopolitanus presbyter agno-
35 scitur, cuius industria in Hierosolymis Martyrium constructum est.

μηνὶ Ἀρτεμισίῳ ια' καταξιωθεὶς τοῦ σωτηριώδους βαπτίσματος ὑπὸ Chron. P.
 Εὐσεβίου ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, βασιλεύσας ἔτη λα' καὶ μῆνας ι'. καὶ κατέλειπε Καίσαρας τοὺς τρεῖς νιόντας αὐτοῦ, Κωνσταντίνον Καίσαρα, βασιλεύοντα τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν μερῶν, ἔχοντα τῆς 5 βασιλείας ἔτος κ'. καὶ Κωνστάντιον τὸν μετ' αὐτὸν Καίσαρα ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀνατολὴν μέρεσιν, ἔτος ἄγοντα τῆς βασιλείας ια'· καὶ Κώνσταντα μετ' αὐτὸν Καίσαρα, ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν μέρεσι διάγοντα, τῆς βασιλείας ἔτος ἄγοντα τρίτον· καὶ Δαλματίον Καίσαρα, νιὸν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ, ἔτος ἄγοντα καὶ αὐτὸν τρίτον
 10 'Ο τρισμακάριος Κωνσταντίνος ἀνεπαύσατο μηνὶ Μαΐῳ κβ' πρὸ

3—8 vgl. Philostorg. II 16^b u. III 1^a

1 ἀρτεμησίῳ u. am Rand μαϊῷ V | σριώδους V^c σριδου V | **2** Εὐσεβίου ἐπισκόπου **K**. vgl. unt. Theophan. Z. 19 f u. Hier. Chron. Z. 30 | **2/3** vgl. Chron. P. 517, 23: ἐβασίλευσεν δὲ (näml. ὁ Κωνσταντῖνος) ἔτη λα' μῆνας ι';
 15 Chron. CE S. 87 Z. 18 f: »cum regnavisset rex Constantinus annos triginta et unum et menses octo« | **3** κατέλιπε Rader | **4** ἔχοντα] ob ἄγοντα wie unt. Z. 6 u. 8? du Cange | **10** τρισμακάριος V | **10/11** πρὸ ια' καλανδῶν Ιουνίων = Chron. min. ed. Mommsen I 235 a. 337; s. Frick, Byz. Zeitschr. 1 291

τότε καταξιωθεὶς τοῦ ἀγίου βαπτίσματος ὑπὸ Εὐσεβίου τοῦ Νικομηδείας μετατεθέντος ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει. S. 33, 23: "Εζησε δὲ (näml. ὁ Κωνσταντῖνος) . . . βασιλεύσας ἔτη λα' καὶ μῆνας ι'. S. 34, 16: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 3829) Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἀγίου ἀναπαυσαμένου, οἱ τρεῖς νιὸι ἐκράτησαν τῶν Ῥωμαίων, τῆς μὲν Ἐφραίμ Κωνστάντιος, τῶν δὲ Γαλλιῶν Κώνστας, καὶ Κωνσταντίνος τῆς Ἰταλίας.

25 **21** ἔτος λα' b ἔτη λβ' dem | **24** γαλλιῶν HSS | ἵτταλίας b

13^d — Ebd. Z. 24: Et deinceps ex hoc mundo pie exiit, qui regnaverat annos XXXII; post eum eius filii Constantius et Constantinus et Constans annos XIII. Chron. M.

13^e — a. Abr. 2353: Constantinus extremo vitae suaee tempore ab Hier. Obron. 30 Eusebio Nicomedensi episcopo baptizatus in Arrianum dogma declinat a quo usque in praesens tempus ecclesiarum rapinae et totius orbis est secuta discordia.

Constantinus . . . in Acyrone . . . moritur . . . post quem tres liberi eius ex Caesaribus Augusti appellantur.

Chron. P. **ια'** καλανδῶν Ἰουνίων ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀγίᾳ Πεντηκοστῇ. ἔτι κειμένου ἀτάφου τοῦ σκηνώματος Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ εὺσεβοῦς ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ φυλαττομένου ἔως οὗ γνῶσιν οἱ νιοὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀκούσας Κωνστάντιος ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ ἐν Μεσοποταμίᾳ ἔτι τοῦ Περ-
5 σικοῦ πολέμου ἐπικειμένου, εὐθέως ἐξόρμησεν ἐπὶ Κωνσταντινούπολιν. ἐν ᾧ παραγενόμενος προεκόμισε τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα Κωνσταντίνον τὸν ἀοίδιμον ἐν τοσαύτῃ παρατάξει καὶ δόξῃ βασιλικῆς προόδου, ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν κατ' ἄξιαν, παρόντος στρατοπέδου ὡς ἐπὶ ζῶντος ἐν ὁπλοφορίᾳ τῆς τε πόλεως ἀπάσης ἄτε καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀνηγορευ-
10 μένης Ῥώμης, καὶ δὴ ὄσα γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐνδοξά τε καὶ σιτομέτρια τῶν δωρηθεισῶν ἀννωνῶν, ἐν πένθει τοσούτῳ πάντων ὄντων, ὡς οὐκ ἔγένετο πώποτε βασιλέα τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ δοξασθῆναι οὕτως ἐν τῇ ζωῇ καὶ μετὰ θάνατον. καὶ κατετέθη ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῶν ἀγίων ἀποστόλων ἐν ὅπερι ἀπόκεινται λείψανα τῶν ἀγίων ἀποστόλων Ἀνδρέου
15 καὶ Λουκᾶ τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ καὶ Τιμοθέου μαθητοῦ Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου.

Σάπωρις, ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεύς, ἐπῆλθεν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ πορθή-

1 ff vgl. Philostorg. II 16 — **1—14** vgl. Euseb. V. C. IV 64—71. Socrat. I 40, 1 f. Sozomen. II 34, 5. Zonar. XIII 4, 28. Theodoret H. E. I 34

20 **1** ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀγίᾳ Πεντηκοστῇ wie bei Michael 260, 9; vgl. Euseb. V. C. IV 64 | **5** ἐξόρμησεν V | **6** πρεκόμισε V προεκόμισε ^{Vc} | **8** στρατο-
παίδουν V | ἐπιζώντος sic V ἔτι ζῶντος du Cange | **10** δὴ ὄσα V, ob δι'
ὅσα? | **11** δωρηθησῶν ἀνώνων V, vgl. unt. S. 220, 8 | **12** πόποτε V

Theopan. **13^f** — S. 34, 32: Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει Σαβώρης, ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεύς,

25 **24** σαβώρισ b > f

Chron. M. **13^g** — Ebd. Z. 32: Šabur, βασιλεὺς Persarum, venit in Mesopotamiam

Jak. Edess. **13^h** — S. 216: Šabur contra Nisibin bello ascendit, et ab ea pude-

27 ff auch bei Michael 260, 1 ff u. Chron. CE S. 87 übersetzt von Nau, Revue Orient Chrétien 1908 S. 438

Hier. Chron. **13ⁱ** — a. Abr. 2354b: Sapor rex Persarum Mesopotamia vastata

31 duobus ferme mensibus Nisibin obsedit.

σων τὴν Νήσιβην, καὶ παρακαθίσας αὐτὴν ἡμέρας ξύ' καὶ μὴ κατι^{Chron. P.}
σχύσας αὐτῆς ἀνεχώρησεν.

1 νήσιβην sic V

ἐπῆλθε τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ πορθήσων Νισίβιν, καὶ παρεκάθισεν αὐτὴν ^{Theophan.}
5 ἡμέρας ξύ', καὶ μὴ κατισχύσας λαβεῖν αὐτὴν ἀνεχώρησεν.

'Ιάκωβος δέ, Νισιβηνῶν ἐπίσκοπος, ἐν τῷ τῆς θεοσεβείας ἥθει
διαμένων εὐχαῖς τὰ κατὰ γνώμην ῥαδίως ἔξήνυσεν. ὅστις καὶ τῶν
Περσῶν τὴν Νισίβιν ἐλπιζόντων καταστρέψασθαι διημαρτηκέναι τῆς
ἐλπίδος πεποίηκεν. αὐτίκα γάρ τῆς μὲν πόλεως ὑπεχώρουν τῷ τῆς
10 εὐχῆς πνεύματι διωκόμενοι, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἑαυτῶν χώραν ἐλθόντες λιμοῦ
τε καὶ λοιμοῦ ὑπεδέξαντο μισθὸν τῆς ἀσεβείας ἥσπερ ἔδρων ἀντι-
λαμβάνοντες.

14 — S. 35, 30: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5831) Κωνσταντίνος, ὁ νίδιος
τοῦ μεγάλου Κωνσταντίνου, ἐπελθὼν τοῖς Κάρονταντος, τοῦ ιδίου
15 ἀδελφοῦ, μέρεσι καὶ συμβαλῶν πόλεμον ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἀνηρέθη.
καὶ ἐκράτησε Κάροντας μόνος πάσης τῆς ἐσπερίου γῆς.

8 ff vgl. Philostorg. III 23. Theodoret H. E. II 30 — 13 — 16 vgl. Philostorg. III 1

4 νίσιβιν g νησιβην sic c | αὐτὴν de Boor αὐτῆ HSS | 6 δέ > b |
νισιβινῶν bdegn νησιβινῶν c νισιβῶν f | 8 νησιβιν c νίσιβιν g | 15 οτρα-
20 τιωτῶν] ob στρατηγῶν [wie Eutrop. X 9, 2 usw.]? de Boor; vgl. Chron. P. 518, 2:
ἀλλὰ Κωνσταντίνον μὲν ἀνεῖλον οἱ Κάροντα στρατιῶται; Michael 268, 1, Socrat.
II 5 u. Malalas 325, 3: ἐσφάγη . . . ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ

πορθήσων Nisibin καὶ παρεκάθισεν αὐτὴν ἡμέρας sexaginta sex. et ^{Chron. M.}
Iacobus, episcopus Nisibis, per εὐχὴν suam reppulit exercitum ab ea;
25 et cum εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῶν χώραν reversi essent, λιμὸν καὶ λοιμὸν in-
venerunt coram se μισθόν.

14^a — Ebd. Folge: Episcopus Alexandriae XIX^{us} Gregorius.
Constantinus novus decessit; regnaverat annos XXV.

factus revertitur per εὐχὴν Iacobi episcopi. et statim furens profectus ^{Jak. Eddess.}
30 omnem regionem Meso<potamiae> diripit et vastat anno *

13^j Ebd. d: Iacobus Nisibenus episcopus agnoscitur, ad cuius ^{Hier. Chron.}
preces saepe urbs discrimine liberata est.

Theophan. 15 — S. 36, 10: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5832) Κωνστάντιος Ἀμιδανοίκοδομεῖ τειχίσας γενναίως. κτίζει καὶ Κωνσταντίαν, τὴν πρώην Ἀντωνίου πόλιν λεγομένην, ἐπονομάσας αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ, διεστῶσαν Ἀμίδης σταδίους ψ' κατὰ μεσημβρίαν.

5 16 — S. 36, 28: Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5833) Ἀντιόχεια ὑπὸ σεισμῶν μεγάλων ἐπὶ τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐκινδύνευσεν.

⁷ Ήν δὲ ἡ ἐγκαινισθεῖσα ἐκκλησία σφαιροειδῆς ἔξ ἔτεσι κτισθεῖσα, ὑπὸ μὲν Κωνσταντίου τοῦ μεγάλου θεμελιωθεῖσα, ὑπὸ Κωνσταντίου δὲ πληρωθεῖσα καὶ ἐγκαινισθεῖσα.

10 8 vgl. ob. S. 205, 19 f 29 ff u. 36 f

1 ἀμίδαν γ' ἀμιδὰν b ἄμμιδαν g | **2** κωνσταντίναν b | **3** ob Ἀντωνίου πόλιν [vgl. Ammian. Marcell. XVIII 9, 1]? de Boor; richtig, s. unt. Z. 18 | **4** ἀμίδης b ἄμμιδης g | ψ' c | **7** ἔξ vgl. aber unt. Z. 20 u. 34 u. ob. S. 205, 19 f 29 ff u. 36 f

Chron. M. 15^a — S. 102, 17: Etiam in Mesopotamia φύκοδόμησεν (*nämlich Constantius*) Amidam civitatem, quam Augustam Constantinam appellavit. rursum in Osrhoene urbem condidit, quam appellavit Constantinam, τὴν πρώην λεγομένην Antoninapolin.

20 16^a — Ebd. Z. 3: Antiochiae Syriae ecclesia quae est σφαιροειδῆς ἐπληρώθη intra XV annos. eius dedicationem celebravit Constantius diebus episcopi Flaccilli [Fliqilpos *Cod.*], die Epiphaniae salvatoris nostri.

Episcopus Antiochiae XXVIII^{us} Stephanus.

Antiochia ὑπὸ σεισμῶν μεγάλων per dies XIII ἐκινδύνευσεν (*wörtlich: in κινδύνῳ fuit*).

23 vgl. Agapius de Menbidj Histoire universelle, übersetzt von Vasilief, Patrologia Orientalis VII fasc. 4 S. 569

Michael 15^b — S. 267, 21: Et in Mesopotamia auxit Amidam et ornavit eam et appellavit eam Augustam, et Tellam τὴν πρώην Antipolim 30 λεγομένην appellavit Constant.

28 ff vgl. Jak. Edess. 218 [hilft nicht]

Hier. Chron. 16^b — a. Abr. 2357: Multae Orientis urbes terrae motu horribili consederunt.

a. Abr. 2358: Antiochiae dominicum aureum dedicatur.

17 — S. 37, 11: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5834) Κωνστάντιος Ἀσσυρίους Theophan. νικήσας ἐθριάμβευσεν.

Σαβώρης δέ, ὁ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεὺς, πρὸς τοῖς αὐτοῦ κακοῖς 5 καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ χείρα Χριστιανοὺς ἐδίωκεν.

Κώνστας δὲ ἐν τῇ Δύσει Φράγγους ἐπόρθησεν.

Σεισμοῦ δὲ γενομένου μεγάλου ἐν Κύπρῳ, Σαλαμίνης τῆς πόλεως τὰ πλείστα διαπέπτωκεν.

18 — S. 37, 18: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5835) σεισμοῦ μεγάλου γενομένου, Νεοκαισάρεια Πόντου κατεπτώθη πλὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῦ 10 ἐπισκοπείου καὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ εὑρεθέντων εὐλαβῶν ἀνδρῶν.

Οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι συνέβαλον πόλεμον μετὰ Περσῶν καὶ πολλοὺς αὐτῶν ἀνεῖλον.

19 — S. 37, 26: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5836) σεισμοῦ γενομένου μργάλου, Ῥόδος ἡ νῆσος κατέπεσεν.

15 20 — S. 37, 32: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5837) Δυρράκη τῆς Δαλματίας ὑπὸ σεισμοῦ διεφθάρη· καὶ Ῥώμη ἡμέρας τρεῖς ἐκινδύνευσε σεισμένη· τῇ δὲ Καμπανίας ιβ' πόλεις διεφθάρησαν.

1 ff s. Bury, Byz. Zeitschr. V 304 f | **6** σαλαμίνης βδφ σαλμίνης g | **10** ἐπισκοπίουν bdfg | **15** δυρράχειον gA | **15/16** δελματίασ θΑ δερματίασ g | **20** **16** ἐκινδύνευε^b

17^a — S. 102, 9: Šabur Christianos persecutus est.

Chron. M.

18^a — Ebd. Folge: Neocaesarea Ponti submersa est πλὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου (*sic*) καὶ ἀνδρῶν εὐλαβῶν qui in ea <versabantur>.

6 f 16 f u. 22 f auch bei Michael 271, 1—13 [= Joh. Ephes.]

25 17^b — a. Abr. 2360 q: Sapor Persarum rex Christianos persequitur.

Hier. Chron.

18^b — Ebd. r: Neocaesaria in Ponto subversa, excepta ecclesia et episcopo ceterisque qui ibidem reperti sunt.

20^a — a. Abr. 2361: Dyrrachium terrae motu conruit, et tribus 30 diebus ac noctibus Roma nutavit, plurimaeque Campania urbes vexatae.

Theophan. 21 — S. 38, 6: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5838) Κωνστάντιος τὸν ἐν Σελευκείᾳ τῆς Συρίας λιμένα πεποίηκεν ὄρος ἐπὶ πολὺ διατεμών, καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀνφορδόμησεν.

Καὶ πόλιν ἔκτισεν ἐν τῇ Φοινίκῃ, ἵνα Κωνσταντίαν κέκληκεν, τὸ 5 πρότερον καλούμενην Ἀντάραδον.

Σαβώρης δέ, ὁ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεύς, ἐπελθὼν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ Νισίβιν παρεκάθισεν ἡμέρας οἴ' καὶ πάλιν αἰσχυνθεὶς ἀνεχώρησεν.

Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει ἔκλειψις ἥλιου ἐγένετο, ὥστε καὶ ἀστέρας φανῆναι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐν ὥρᾳ τρίτῃ τῆς ἡμέρας μηνὶ Δαισίῳ ζ'.

10 22 — S. 39, 1: Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5839) ὁ ἥλιος πάλιν αὐχμηρότερος γέγονεν ἐν ὥρᾳ δευτέρᾳ τῆς κυριακῆς ἡμέρας.

23 — S. 39, 3: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5840) σεισμοῦ γενομένου μεγάλου ἐν Βηρυτῷ τῆς Φοινίκης, τὸ πλεῖστον τῆς πόλεως πέπτωκεν, ὥστε πλῆθος τῶν ἐθνικῶν εἰσελθητέναι εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὁμοίως ἡμῖν 15 χριστιανίζειν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι. ἐντεῦθεν νεωτερίσαντές τινες τοὺς τύπους τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὕσπερ ἀποσυλήσαντες ἔξήεσαν, καὶ τόπον εὐχῆς ἐπονομάσαντες τὸ πλῆθος ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπεδέξαντο, ὅπαντα τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας μιμούμενοι, παραπλήσιον γεγονότες πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὡς ἡ τῶν Σαμαρειῶν πρὸς Ἰουδαίους αὔρεσις, ἐθνικῶς ζῶντες.

20 2 σελευκία b | 3 ἀνοικοδόμησεν b | 4/5 τὸ πρῶτον dy | 6 σαπώρης c σαπώρισ b | τὴν μεσοποταμίαν b | 7 νίσιβιν g νησίβιν c | 8/9 »totale Sonnenfinsternis 6 Juni 346« Boll, Pauly's RE VI 2362 | 10/11 »totale Sonnenfinsternis 9 Oct. 348« Boll, ebd. 2363 | 11 ἐν >bd | 15 ἐπαγγειλάμενοι cgy | 16 ἔξήεσαν c ἔξίεσαν bdgy resecauerunt (ἔξεσαν? de Boor) A

Chron. M. 21^a — S. 102, 13: Constantius τὸν λιμένα (*im Syr.*) Seleucide in 26 Isauria (*sic, st.* Syria) πεποίηκε, διατεμών ὄρος ἐπὶ πολύ, καὶ τὴν πόλιν ϕοκδόμησεν.

In Phoenice πόλιν ἔκτισεν ἵνα Constantiam κέκληκεν· τὸ πρότερον δὲ ἐκαλεῖτο Antaradus.

30 25 ff vgl. Michael 267, 20

Hier. Chron. 21^b — a. Abr. 2361: Magnis recipublicae expensis in Seleucia Syriae portus effectus.

a. Abr. 2362: Rursum Sapor tribus mensibus obsidet Nisibin.

? [Eusebius Emisenus Arrianae signifer factionis multa et varia 35 conscribit.]

Solis facta defectio.

34 f vgl. Michael 271, 3 f

24 — a. 350 S. 535, 14: Ὁ μακάριος Λεόντιος, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Ἀντιοχείας τῆς Συρίας, ἀνὴρ κατὰ πάντα πιστός τε καὶ εὐλαβῆς καὶ ζηλωτῆς ὑπάρχων τῆς ἀληθοῦς πίστεως, ἐπιμελούμενος δὲ καὶ τῶν ξενοδοχείων ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ξένων θεραπείας, κατέστησεν ἄνδρας 5 εὐλαβεῖς ἐν τῇ τούτων φροντίδι· ἐν οἷς ἐγένοντο τρεῖς σφόδρα ξηλωταὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας. οὗτοι διά τινα χρείαν ὥρμησαν εἰς χωρίον ἀπὸ ιζημαίων Ὀντιοχείας, ὅνομα δὲ τὸ χωρίον Θρακόων κώμη λεγομένη. τούτοις συνάδευεν περιτυχῶν Ἰουδαῖος τις, ἦν δὲ ὁ προηγούμενος τῶν τριῶν ἀδελφῶν εὐλαβέστατος ἀνὴρ, Εὐγένιος τούνομα, ἐν δὲ 10 τῷ συνοδεύειν ἀρξάμενος ὁ Εὐγένιος ἐκίνει λόγον πρὸς τὸν Ἰουδαῖον περὶ τῆς τοῦ μονογενοῦς νιοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ πίστεως. τοῦ δὲ Ἰουδαίου διαχλευάζοντος, ηγέρηθη ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ὅφις νεκρὸς κείμενος. καὶ εὐθέως ὁ Ἰουδαῖος πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγει· »ἐὰν φάγητε τὸν ὅφιν τοῦτον τὸν νεκρὸν καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνητε, γίνομαι Χριστιανός. καὶ 15 εὐθέως ὁ Εὐγένιος λαβὼν τὸν ὅφιν διεῖλεν εἰς τρία μέρη ἑαυτῷ καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ δυσί, καὶ ἔφαγον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Ἰουδαίου, καὶ ἔζησαν. ἐφ' οὓς ἐπληροῦντο τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν καὶ σωτῆριον λόγιον τὸ φῆσαν· »καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν ὅφεις ἀροῦσιν, καὶ θανάσιμόν τι φάγωσιν, οὐ μὴ αὐτοῖς ἀδικήσει«. ὁ δὲ Ἰουδαῖος συνεισελθὼν 20 αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ ξενῶνι καὶ διαμείνας ἐν αὐτῷ ηὐδοκίμει Χριστιανὸς γενόμενος.

Κωνστάντιος ὁ Αὔγουστος διατρίβων ἐν τοῖς ἀνατολικοῖς μέρεσιν διὰ τὸν Περσικὸν πόλεμον, ἀκούσας τὰ κατὰ Μαγνέντιον, ἔξωρμησεν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀντιοχέων ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν.

25 — **1 ff** vgl. Philostorg. ob. S. 48, 12 ff — **18 f** Mark. 16, 18. Luk. 10, 19
— **22 ff** vgl. Philostorg. III 22

5 εὐλαβῆς V | 7 Θρακόων sic V, ob Θρακῷ? | κόμη V | 8 συνάδευεν V |
| 10 τῷ] τὸ V | ἐκίνει Dindorf ἐκείνη V | 14 γίνομε | 15 διήλεν V |
μέρει V | 17 φείσαν V | 20 ηὐδοκίμη V | 22 διατρίβον V

30 — 24^a — S. 43, 32: Μαγνεντίου δὲ ἐν Γαλλίαις τυραννήσαντος καὶ Theophan.
Κώνσταντον τὸν εὐσεβῆ ἀνελόντος, Κωνστάντιος ὁ Αὔγουστος διατρίβων
ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ καὶ μαθὼν . . . S. 44, 4: Κωνστάντιος δὲ κατὰ Μαγνεντίου ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν ἔξωρμησεν.

35 — **30/31** vgl. Chron. P. 518, 3: καὶ αὐτὸν δὲ Κώνσταντον Μαγνεντίος τις τύραννας ἀνείλεν.

24^b — S. 102, 12: Episcopus Antiochiae XXIX^{us} Leontius, vir Chron. M.
εὐλαβῆς (? s. ob. Z. 2).

24^c — S. 103, 16: Et mortuus est Constantinus, et Constans.

Chron. P. Σάπωρις δέ, ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεύς, ἐπελθὼν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ καὶ παρακαθίσας ἡμέρας ρ' τὴν Νήσηβι, καὶ διαφόρως αὐτὴν πολεμήσας καὶ μηχαναῖς πολλαῖς χρησάμενος, ὡς καὶ ἐλεφάντων πλῆθος ἀγαγεῖν ἐπιτηδείων πρὸς συμμαχίαν καὶ βασιλεῖς μισθωτοὺς μαγγανικά
 5 τε παντοῖα, οἵς, εἰ μὴ βούλοιντο τὴν πόλιν ἐκχωρήσειν, ἔξαφανίζειν αὐτὴν ἐκ βάθρων ἡπείλουν· τῶν δὲ Νησιβινῶν ἀντεχόντων πρὸς τὴν παράδοσιν, τὸ λοιπὸν ἐξυδατῶσαι ταύτην τῷ πρὸς αὐτὴν ποταμῷ διεγνώκει ὁ Σάπωρις. οἱ δὲ Νησιβινοὶ εὐχαῖς ἐνίκουν τοὺς πολεμίους εὑμενῆ τὸν θεὸν ἔχοντες. τῶν γὰρ ὑδάτων μελλόντων
 10 τὴν θέσιν τῶν τειχέων ἐξομαλίζειν εἰς πτῶσιν, μέρος τοῦ τείχους πεπόνθει κατὰ θεοῦ συγχώρησιν ἐπὶ τῷ συμφέροντι, καθὼς ἐν τοῖς ἔξῆς δηλωθήσεται. γίνεται γὰρ τήν τε πόλιν φυλαχθῆναι καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους τοῖς ὕδασιν ἀντέχεσθαι, ὡς καὶ πολλοὺς ἀπολέσθαι.

1 ff vgl. Philostorg. III 23 — 1—S. 217, 9 vgl. Theodoret H. E. II 30, 3—8.

- 15 Zonar. XIII 7, 1—12. Julian. Orat. II S. 62 B ff u. I S. 27 ff. Ephraemi Carmina Nisibena I ff ed. Bickell [s. Bickell ebd. S. 14 f]. Gedichte des Ephräm übersetzt von Bickell, Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. 1878 II S. 345

- 20 **2** νήσηβι, β durch Corr., V; s. unt. Hier. Chron. Z. 39 u. Register | **4** ἐπιτηδίων V | συμμαχίαν V | **5** τὴν πόλιν usw., vgl. unt. Z. 25 ff die Version von Theophan. | **7** παράδοσιν, τὸ λοιπὸν ἐξύδατωσε V | **11** πεπόνθη V | τῷ] τὸ aus τῷ; corr. V | **13** ἀπώλεσθαι sic V

- Theophan. **24^d** — S. 39, 13: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5841) Σαβώρης πάλιν, ὁ βασιλεὺς Περσῶν, τὴν Νησίβιν παρακαθεσθεὶς ἱκανῶς αὐτῇ διηνόχλει, ὡς καὶ ἐλεφάντων πλῆθος ἀγαγεῖν ἐπιτηδείων πρὸς συμμαχίαν καὶ **25** βασιλεῖς μισθωτοὺς μάγγανά τε παντοῖα, οἵς, εἰ μὴ βούλοιντο ἐκχωρήσειν, τὴν πόλιν ἔξαφανίζειν ἐκ βάθρων ἡπείλουν. τῶν δὲ Νησιβηνῶν ἀντεχόντων πρὸς τὴν παράδοσιν, τότε λοιπὸν ἐξυδατῶσαι ταύτην τῷ πρὸς αὐτῇ ποταμῷ διεγνώκει. οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες ταῖς εὐχαῖς ἐνίκων τοὺς πολεμίους εὑμενῆ τὸν θεὸν ἔχοντες. τῶν γὰρ ὑδάτων μελλόντων τὴν θέσιν τῶν τειχῶν ἐξομαλίζειν πρὸς τὴν πτῶσιν, μέρος μέν τι τοῦ τείχους ἐπεπόνθει, καὶ τοῦτο κατὰ θεοῦ συγχώρησιν, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἔξῆς δηλωθήσεται. εὐθέως γὰρ γίνεται τήν τε πόλιν φυλαχθῆναι καὶ τοὺς πολεμίους τοῖς ὕδασι νήχεσθαι καὶ πολλοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος διεφθάρθαι.

- 35 **23** τῇ νίσιβι em τῇ νίσιβι g τῇ νίσιβι fx | **26/27** νισιβινῶν degm νησιβινῶν c ισιβίνων b | **28** αὐτὴν gxy | **30/31** μέντοι b | **32** γὰρ cg > bdy, s. ob. z. 12

- Hier. Chron. **24^e** — a. Abr. 2363: Neque vero ullum Constantio ex VIII gravissimis proeliis contra Persas bellum fuit <gravius>. nam, ut alia omittam, Nisibis (nisibi ALNP) obsessa [Folge unt. S. 226 Anm. zu Z. 18].

Οι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο πεπονθότες ἡπείλουν διὰ τοῦ καταπεσόντος Chron. P.
 μέρους τοῦ τείχους εἰσελθεῖν, παραστήσαντες τοὺς ἐλέφαντας ἐνόπλους
 καὶ ὅχλον συμπείσαντες ἐμβριθέστερον προσέχειν τῷ πολέμῳ μαγγά-
 νοις παντοίοις μηχανώμενοι. οἱ δὲ τὴν πόλιν φρουροῦντες στρατιώ-
 5 ται νίκην ἐκ θεοῦ προνοίας ἐσχήκασι. τὸν γὰρ τόπον ἀπαντα παν-
 τοίοις ὅπλοις ἐπλήρουν, καὶ ὄνάγροις τοὺς πλείονας ἐλέφαντας,
 ἀπέκτειναν· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐν τοῖς κατατέλμασι τῶν τάφρων ἐνέπεσαν,
 ἄλλοι δὲ κρουσθέντες ἀπεστράφησαν εἰς τὰ ὄπίσω, καὶ ὑπὲρ μυρίους
 10 αὐτῶν ὁπλίτας ἀπέκτειναν. καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς σκηπτὸς οὐρανόθεν
 ἔπεσεν, νεφελῶν τε γνοφωδῶν καὶ ὑετοῦ λάβρου καὶ βροντῶ φω-
 ναῖς ἀπαντας ἔξεπληττον, ὡς τοὺς πλείονας αὐτῶν φόβῳ διαφθα-
 ρῆναι. πάντοθεν δὲ ὁ νέος Φαραὼ Σάπωρις στενούμενος ἡττᾶτο,
 τοῖς τοῦ φόβου κύμασι δεινῶς καταντλούμενος. μέλλων τε καθαιρεῖν
 αὐτήν, τοῦ τείχους ῥῆγμα μέγιστον ὑπομείναντος καὶ τῆς πόλεως
 15 λοιπὸν προδίδοσθαι μελλούσης, ὅρασις ἐδείχθη ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῷ Σά-
 πωρι, καθ' ἣν ὕραν ἐπολέμει, ἀνήρ τις περιτρέχων εἰς τὰ τείχη τῆς
 Νήσιβης· ἦν δὲ ὁ φαινόμενος τῷ εἶδει Κωνστάντιος ὁ Αὔγουστος, ὡς

8 vgl. Ammian. Marcellin. XXV 1, 15 — **15** — S. 218, 16 vgl. Theodoret H. E. II 30, 8—10 u. 14

20 **6** am Rand οργανα πολεμηκα (sic) mit Hinweisungszeichen über ὄνάγροις
 V | **7** οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ] ἔτεροι δὲ Theophan. unt. Z. 29, besser | **9** οὐρανόθεν
 V | **10** γνωφοδῶν V | **10/11** φωναὶ wäre besser, vgl. unt. Z. 33 | **11/12**
 διαφθαρεῖναι V | **15** λοιπῶν V | **16** τείχει V | **17** νήσιβης sic V

Οι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο πεπονθότες ἡπείλουν διὰ τοῦ καταπεσόντος Theophan.
 25 τείχους εἰσελθεῖν, παραστήσαντες τοὺς ἐλέφαντας ἐνόπλους καὶ τὸν
 ὅχλον εὐτρεπίσαντες προσέχειν ἐμβριθέστερον τῷ πολέμῳ μαγγάνοις
 τε παντοίοις. οἱ δὲ τὴν πόλιν φρουροῦντες στρατιώται ἐντεῦθεν
 τὴν νίκην θεοῦ προνοίᾳ ἐσχήκασι τὸν τε τόπον ἐπλήρουν παντοίοις
 ὅπλοις, ὄνάγροις δὲ τοὺς πλείονς ἐλέφαντας ἀπέκτειναν· ἔτεροι δὲ ἐν
 30 τοῖς κατατέλμασι τῶν τάφρων ἐνέπεσον, ἄλλοι δὲ κρουσθέντες ἀπε-
 στράφησαν εἰς τὰ ὄπίσω, καὶ ὑπὲρ μυρίους αὐτῶν ὁπλῖται ἀπέθανον.
 τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς σκηπτὸς οὐρανόθεν ἔπεσεν, καὶ νεφελῶν γνοφωδῶν
 κοι ὑετῶν λάβρων καὶ βροντῶν φωναὶ ἀπαντας ἔξεπληττον, ὡς τοὺς
 πλείονς τῷ φόβῳ διαφθαρῆναι. πάντοθεν δὲ ὁ νέος Φαραὼ Σαβώρης
 35 στενούμενος ἡττᾶτο τοῖς τοῦ φόβου κύμασιν. ὃς ἀτενίσας τοῖς

Chron. P. πλέον ἀγανακτεῖν τὸν Σάπωριν κατὰ τῶν τῆς Νίσιβης οἰκητόρων, λέγοντα ὡς »οὐδὲν ὑμῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἴσχύνει· ἔξελθάτω καὶ πολεμείτω, ἢ παράδοτε τὴν πόλιν«. ἐκείνων δὲ λεγόντων· »οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιον παραδοῦναι ἡμᾶς τὴν πόλιν ἀπόντος τοῦ βασιλέως ἡμῶν Κωσταν-
5 τίου τοῦ Αὐγούστου«, ὡς ἐκ τούτου πλέον ἀγανακτεῖν τὸν Σάπωριν, ψευδομένων αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸ φαινόμενον ἐκείνῳ, καὶ λέγειν αὐτόν· »ἴνα τί ψεύδεσθε; ἐγὼ θεωρῶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς ὄφθαλμοῖς τὸν βασιλέα ὑμῶν Κωνσταντίου περιτρέχοντα εἰς τὰ τείχη τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν«.

Καὶ ἐν τούτοις πολεμηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ποικίλως ὁ Σάπωρις
10 ἄπρακτος ἀνεχώρησεν, θάνατον ἀπειλήσας τοῖς μάγοις αὐτοῦ. μα-
θόντες δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν, διέγνωσαν τοῦ φανέντος ἀγγέλου σὺν τῷ
Κωνσταντίῳ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ ἡρμήνευον αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Σά-
πωρις τοῦ κινδύνου τὴν αἰτίαν, ἐν φόβῳ γεγονὼς ἐκέλευσεν τά τε
μαγγανικὰ καυθῆναι καὶ ὄσα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πολέμου παρασκευὴν
15 ηὐτρέπισεν διαλυθῆναι, αὐτὸς δὲ σὺν τοῖς ιδίοις φυγῇ διωκόμενος
τὴν πατρίδα κατείληφεν, πρότερον λοιμικῇ νόσῳ τῶν πλειόνων
διαφθαρέντων.

Φέρεται δὲ ἐν ἐπιστολῇ Οὐαλαγέσου ἐπισκόπου Νίσιβης τὸ κατὰ
μέρος τούτων †δηλοῦντις.
20 Κωνσταντίου τοῦ Αὐγούστου ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μαγνέντιον ἀπερχο-

1 νίσιβης sic V | 6 καὶ durch Corr. V | 10 ἀνεχώρησεν sic, ρησεν
am Zeilenanfang, V | 15 ηὐτρέπησεν V | 18/19 ἐν ἐπιστολῇ — δηλοῦντις V ἐν
ἐπιστολῇ — δηλούσῃ Rader, ob [ἐν] ἐπιστολῇ — δηλοῦσα? vgl. unt. S. 221, 28 |
18 νίσιβης V νισίβης V^c | 20 κατὰ Μαγνεντίου Rader, aber vgl. unt. S. 221, 9

Theophan. δόφθαλμοῖς πρὸς τῷ καταπεσόντι τοῦ τείχους ὄρῷ ἄγγελον ἐπὶ τὸ
26 ἄκρον ἐστῶτα, λαμπρῶς ἐστολισμένον καὶ παρὰ χεῖρα τὸν βασιλέα
Κωνσταντίου κρατοῦντα.

“Ος εὐθέως ταραχθεὶς τοῖς μάγοις θάνατον ἤπειλει. μαθόντες δὲ
τὴν αἰτίαν, διεγνώκεισαν τοῦ φανέντος τὴν δύναμιν ἐρμηνεύειν τῷ
30 βασιλεῖ, ὡς μείζων ἢ κατ’ αὐτούς. [δι’ ἥς] ἐντεῦθεν ἐπιγνοὺς τοῦ
κινδύνου τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ ἔμφοβος γεγονὼς ἐκέλευσε τά τε μάγγανα
καῆναι καὶ ὄσα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πολέμου παρασκευὴν εὐτρέπισε διαλυ-
θῆναι. αὐτὸς δὲ σὺν τοῖς ιδίοις φυγῇ ἐδίωκε τὴν πατρίδα, πρότερον
λοιμικῇ νόσῳ διαφθαρέντες.

35 24^f — S. 44, 5 [unmittelbar nach ἐξώρυησεν ob. S. 215, 33]: Ἡ δὲ

30 δι’ ἥς > c, [δι’ ἥς] Classen u. de Boor | 32 εὐτρέπησε b ηὐτρέπισε
die übr. HSS

μένου πολέμῳ, πρὶν ἦ φθάσαι αὐτόν, Κωνστάντια, ἡ Κωνσταντίου Chron. P.
 ἀδελφή, ἐνδύσασα Βετρανίωνα πορφύραν καλάνδαις Μαρτίαις εἰς βα-
 σιλέα ἐν Ναϊσῷ τῆς Ἰταλίας, ἄνδρα ἔντιμον, ἀνέστησε τῷ Μαγνεντίῳ
 πρὸς τὴν μάχην. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα φθάσας ὁ Κωνστάντιος ἐν οἷς
 5 τόποις ἦν ὁ πόλεμος ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ, προσεδέξατο τὸν Βετρανίωνα
 μετὰ πολλῆς τιμῆς, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῷ κάμπῳ τριβουνάλιον ἐφ'
 ὑψηλὸν ποιήσας, παρόντος αὐτῷ τοῦ στρατοπέδου, συμπαρεστῶτος
 δὲ καὶ τοῦ Βετρανίωνος, ἐδημηγόρει ὁ Κωνστάντιος ἀκόλουθον εἶναι
 10 τῇ βασιλείᾳ τὴν ἔξουσίαν ὑπάρχειν καὶ τῷ ἐκ προγόνων βασιλέων
 διαδεξαμένῳ ταύτην, συμφέρειν δὲ καὶ τῷ κοινῷ δεόντως ὑπὸ μίαν
 ἔξουσίαν διοικεῖσθαι τὰ δημόσια, καὶ ὅσα τούτοις ἀκόλουθα.

1—S. 220, 8 vgl. Philostorg. III 22

1 κωνστάντια sic V | 2 καλάνδαις Μαρτίαις = Chron. min. ed. Mommsen
 I 237 a. 350 | 3 ἐν Ναϊσῷ s. unt. Ann. zu Z. 4/5 | [Ιταλίας] Ἐλλορίας du Cange |
 15 ἀνέστησε vgl. unt. Z. 23 mit Ann. | 4/5 ἐν οἷς τόποις näml. ἐν Ναϊσῷ, vgl.
 Hier. Chron. unt. 24^h | 7 ὑψηλὸν V | στρατοπαίδου V | 8 ἐδημηγόρει V |
 9 τῇ βασιλείᾳ usw., s. die bessere Fassung von Theophan. unt. Z. 28 f |
 τῷ] τὸ V, vgl. unt. Z. 29

σύγκλητος ἐν ᾧ Ρώμη Νεπωτιανὸν ἐνδύσασα κατὰ Μαγνεντίου ἀπέ- Theophan.
 20 λυσεν. ὃς συμβαλὼν τῷ Μαγνεντίῳ ἐν ᾧ Ρώμη ἀναιρεῖται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ,
 βασιλεύσας μῆνας τρεῖς. πρὶν ἦ δὲ φθάσαι ἀπελθεῖν τὸν βασιλέα ἐν
 ᾧ Ρώμῃ, Κωνσταντίᾳ, ἡ καὶ Ἐλένη, ἡ Κωνσταντίου ἀδελφή, ἀνηγόρευσε
 Βρετανίωνα εἰς βασιλέα, ἄνδρα ἔντιμον, καὶ ἀντέστησε τῷ Μαγνεντίῳ
 πρὸς τὴν μάχην. φθάσας δὲ Κωνστάντιος ἐν ᾧ Ρώμῃ καὶ ἀποδεξά-
 25 μενος τὸν Βρετανίωνα μετὰ πολλῆς τιμῆς . . . S. 44, 22: Ἐν δὲ τῷ
 εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν ᾧ Ρώμῃ ἐξελθὼν ἐν τῷ Τριβουναλίῳ κάμπῳ καὶ στὰς
 ἐφ' ὑψους, συμπαρόντος αὐτῷ τοῦ στρατοπέδου καὶ τοῦ Βρετανίωνος,
 ἐδημηγόρει πείθων τὸν λαὸν ἀκόλουθον εἶναι τῇ βασιλείᾳ τὴν
 30 ἔξουσίαν ὑπάρχειν τῷ ἐκ προγόνων βασιλέων διαδεξαμένῳ ταύτην
 συμφέρειν δὲ καὶ τῷ κοινῷ ὑπὸ μίαν ἔξουσίαν διοικεῖσθαι τὰ δημόσια,
 καὶ ὅσα τούτοις ἀκόλουθα.

24 u. 25 f vgl. unt. S. 224, 2 f

19 νεποτιανὸν dfg νεποτιανῷ b | 22 κωνσταντίνα bgx | καὶ > b |
 23 βρετανίωνα dgy | ἀνέστησε g ἀντέστη d | 25 βρετανίωνα gy βρετανί-
 35 ονα d | ἐν δὲ — 26 ᾧ Ρώμη nur in b | 27 βρετανίονος b βρετανίωνος egm
 βρετανίονος df|28 τὴν] καὶ τὴν gxy

24^g — a. Abr. 2366: Quam ob rem turbata re publica Vetranio Hier. Chron.
 Mursae Nepotianus Romae imperatores facti.

Chron. P. Ἐν πᾶσι δὲ τούτοις ἦν ὁ θεὸς μετὰ Κωνσταντίου, εὐοδῶν αὐτῷ τὴν βασιλείαν. ἦν γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς πολλὴν φροντίδα ποιούμενος ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. τὸν δὲ Βετρανίωνα βασιλεύσαντα μῆνας δέκα κατὰ τὴν προειρημένην δημηγορίαν ὁ Κωνστάντιος ἀποδύσας 5 τὴν πορφύραν, κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν καιρὸν τραπέζης αὐτῷ πρὸς ἐστίασιν κοινωνίαν παρέσχετο, καὶ μετὰ πάσης τιμῆς καὶ δορυφορίας καὶ πολλῶν χαρισμάτων ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἐν πόλει Προυσιάδι τῆς Βιθυνίας διάγειν, λαμβάνοντα ἀννώνας καὶ κελλαρικὰ δαψιλῶς. Χριστιανὸς δὲ ὃν ὁ Βετρανίων καὶ παραβάλλων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν 10 συνάξεσιν, ἐποίει ἐλεημοσύνας πένησι, τιμῶν καὶ τοὺς τῆς ἐκκλησίας προεστῶτας ἔως τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ.

25 — a. 351 S. 540, 8: Κωνστάντιος Αὔγουστος μόνος βασιλεύων Γάλλον, ἀνεψιὸν αὐτοῦ, κοινωνὸν τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας Καίσαρα ἀνηγόρευσεν, μετονομάσας αὐτὸν Κωνστάντιον ἵδοις Μαρτίας καὶ ἐν

15 12—S. 221, 2 vgl. Chron. P. a. 304 S. 518, 4—7. Philostorg. III 25

4 δημιγορίαν V | 6 δωρυφορίασ V | 7/8 βηθυνίασ V | 14 ἵδοισ μαρτίασ (u. am Rand μᾶρ τε) V = Chron. min. ed. Mommsen I 238 a. 351 | καὶ übergeschrieben V^c

Theophan. Τότε ἀποδύσας τὸν βρετανίωνα βασιλεύσαντα μῆνας ι', κατ' αὐτὴν 20 τὴν ὥραν τραπέζης αὐτῷ πρὸς ἐστίασιν ἐκοινώνησεν, καὶ μετὰ πάσης τιμῆς καὶ δορυφορίας καὶ πολλῶν χαρισμάτων ἐν Προύσῃ τῆς Βιθυνίας ἀπέστειλεν. Χριστιανὸς δὲ ὃν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐσχόλαζε καὶ πολλὰς ἐλεημοσύνας ἐποίει εἰς τοὺς πένητας· ἐτίμα δὲ καὶ τοὺς ιερεῖς ἔως ἡμέρας τελευτῆς αὐτοῦ.

25 25^a—S. 40, 15: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5842) Κωνστάντιος ὁ Αὔγουστος μόνος βασιλεύων Γάλλον, ἀνεψιὸν ἵδιον, κοινωνὸν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείας Καίσαρα ἀναγορεύσας, μετονομάσας αὐτὸν Κωνστάντιον, ἐν

19 βρετανίονα b βρετανίωνa gy βρετανίονa d | 21 δωρυφορίασ df δωροφορίασ bcegm | 24 ἡμέρας] τῆς c | 27 vor μετονομάσας + καὶ gxy

Chron. M. 25^b — S. 103, 16: Et universo imperio eorum potitus est 31 Constantius eorum frater, qui Gallum Caesarem constituit ut secum regeret imperium.

Hier. Chron. 24^h — a. Abr. 2367: Vetraniōni apud Naissum (naissum ANP u. vor Corr. O) a Constantio regium insigne detractum.

τῇ κατὰ τὴν Ἀνατολὴν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἀπέστειλεν, τῶν Περσῶν ἐπικει- Chron. P.
 μένων. τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὥφθη ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις
 κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον, ὥρα ἦν ὡς γ', ἐν ἡμέρᾳ Πεντηκοστῆ, φω-
 τοειδές τεταμένον νώναις Μαΐας ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅρους τῶν
 5 ἑλαῖων ἔως τοῦ Γολγοθᾶ ἐν ᾧ τόπῳ ἐσταυρώθη ὁ κύριος κατὰ
 ἀνατολάς, ὅθεν ἀνελήφθη ὁ κύριος. κύκλῳ τοῦ φανέντος τιμίου σταυ-
 ροῦ στέφανος ὡς ἡ Ἱρις τὸ εἶδος ἔχων. καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ ὥρᾳ ὥφθη ἐν
 Πανωνίᾳ Κωνσταντίφ τῷ Αὐγούστῳ καὶ τῷ σὸν αὐτῷ στρατῷ ὅντι
 10 ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μαγνέντιον πολέμῳ. καὶ ἀρξαμένου Κωνσταντίου νικᾶν,
 Μαγνεντίου συμβαλόντος αὐτῷ περὶ τὴν λεγομένην Μούρσαν πόλιν,
 ἡττηθεὶς ὁ Μαγνέντιος ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν Γαλλίαν μετ' ὀλίγον.

2—11 vgl. Philostorg. III 26

1 nach Ἀντιοχείᾳ + καὶ ausradiert V | 3/4 φωτοδιδὲς V | 4 νώναις Μαΐας
 15 vgl. Michael 268, 6 f, Chron. min. ed. Mommsen I 238 a. 351 u. Cyrill. Epist. ad
 Constant. 4 | νόνεσ μαΐσιοις m. am Rand μαΐῳ ζ V | 4 ff s. die bessere Fassung
 von Theophan. unt. Z. 24 ff u. Philostorg. 1. 1. | 7 ἵρησ V | 8 τῷ¹] τὸ V |
 11 ἡττηθῆσ V | ὀλίγων Rader, richtig

τῇ Ἀνατολῇ ἀπέστειλε κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, τῶν Περσῶν ἔτι ἐπι- Theophan.
 κειμένων. S. 41, 30: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5847) Μάξιμον τὸν Ἱεροσο-
 20 λύμων καθεῖλεν Ἀκάκιος ὁ Καισαρείας καὶ Πατρόφιλος ὁ Σκυθοπόλεως
 Ἀρειανὸι ὅντες, καὶ ἀντεισήγαγον Κύριλλον δοκοῦντες ἔχειν αὐτὸν
 ὄμόφρονα. ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ, Κυρίλλου ἐπισκοποῦντος "Ιεροσο-
 λύμων, τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ ἐφάνη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ τῇ
 ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, φωτοειδές, τεταμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ Γολγοθᾶ,
 25 ἐνθα ἐσταυρώθη ὁ Χριστός, ἔως τοῦ ὅρους τῶν ἑλαιῶν, ὅθεν ἀνε-
 λήφθη. κύκλῳ δὲ τοῦ φανέντος σημείου στέφανος, ὡς Ἱρις τὸ εἶδος
 ἔχων. καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ Κωνσταντίφ ὥφθη. περὶ τούτου
 δὲ φέρεται Κυρίλλου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Κωνστάντιον, ἐν
 ἥ εὐσεβέστατον αὐτὸν καλεῖ. ὅθεν τινὲς Ἀρειανόφρονα διαβάλλουσι
 30 τὸν αὐτὸν Κύριλλον λέγοντες καὶ τὴν τοῦ ὄμοουσίου φωνὴν παρα-
 σειγηκέναι αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς κατηχήσεσιν αἵξ ἔξεθετο ἐπ' ὥφελείᾳ τῶν
 ἀπείρων λαῶν, τῶν τῷ θείῳ προσελθόντων βαπτίσματι διὰ τὸ θαῦμα
 τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ. σφάλλονται δὲ καὶ ἀμαρτάνουσιν. S. 44, 12:
 'Ἐπολέμησαν ἄμφω (näml. ὁ Κωνστάντιος καὶ ὁ Βρετανίων) τὸν Μα-
 35 γνέντιον περὶ Μούρσαν. καὶ ἡττηθεὶς ὁ Μαγνέντιος ἔφυγεν ἐπὶ Ἰταλίαν.

19 ff vgl. Sozomen. IV 20, 1. Socrat. II 38, 2. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2364
 — 28 ff Cyrill. Epist. ad Constant. PG 33, 1165—1176 — 29 ff vgl. Alexand.
 Monach. Invent. S. Crucis PG 87, 4069 B

27 δὲ > dgy | περὶ τούτου — 28 Κωνστάντιον vgl. Exc. Tripart. bei Cramer
 40 Anecd. Paris. II 95, 18 | 35 μοῦρσαν bem μούρσαν f | nach ἐπὶ + τὸν dgy

Chron. P. 26 — Ebd. Folge: Κωνστάντιος δὲ ὁ καὶ Γάλλος, ὁ προειρημένος Καῖσαρ, ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ διῆγεν.

27 — a. 354 S. 541, 10: Ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Μαγνέντιος, πάλιν συμβαλὼν ἐν Μούστῳ Σελεύκῳ, ἡττηθεὶς ἔφυγεν μόνος ἐν Γαλλίαις 5 εἰς Λουγδούνων πόλιν, καὶ ὅτε τὸν ἕδιον ἀδελφὸν ἔσφαξεν, τότε καὶ ἐαυτὸν ἀνεῖλεν πρὸ τεσσάρων ἵδων Αὐγούστου.

3—6 vgl. Philostorg. III 26 ob. S. 52; 11—17. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2369 u. Eutrop. X 12, 2

4 μούστῳ sic V, aber vgl. unt. Z. 20 u. Socrat. II 32, 6: Μοντοσέλευκος
10 (sic T = Cass.); Sozomen. IV 7, 3: Μοντιοσέλευκον; Itiner. Hierosolym. ed. Geyer S. 5, 20: *mansio monte Seleuci* usw. | 5 Λουγδούνων vgl. unt. Z. 20 u. ob. S. 52, 13 | 6 προτεσσάρων ἵδων αὐγούστου u. am Rand αὐγοῦστος ī V, vgl. Chron. min. ed. Mommsen I 238 a. 353: *die III id. Aug.*

Theophan. 26^a — S. 40, 20: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5843) οἱ κατὰ Παλαιστίνην
15 Ἰουδαῖοι ἀντῆραν καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν ἀλλοεθνῶν, Ἐλλήνων τε καὶ Σαμαρειτῶν, ἀνεῖλον· καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ παγγενεὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ στρατοῦ Ῥωμαίων ἀνηρέθησαν, καὶ ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν Διοκαισάρεια ἡφανίσθη.

27^a — S. 44, 13 [unmittelbar nach Ίταλίαν ob. S. 221, 35]: Πολλάκις
δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν Κωνσταντίου πολεμηθεὶς (näml. ὁ Μαγνέντιος),
20 συμβαλὼν ἐν Μόντῳ Σελεύκῳ καὶ ἡττηθεὶς ἔφυγεν εἰς Λουγδούνον.

14 ff vgl. Socrat. II 33. Sozomen. IV 7, 5. Aurel. Victor Caes. 42, 11. Michael 268, 16 f. Agapius de Menbidj Histoire universelle, übersetzt von Vasilief Patriologia orientalis VII fasc. 4 S. 571 f

14 ff vgl. Agapius de Menbidj 1. 1.: »En l'an 18 de Constance et en l'an 3
25 de Gallus, les Juifs de Palestine se révoltèrent, assaillirent différentes villes, et y capturèrent et tuèrent beaucoup de gens« usw. | 17 διὸ καὶ σαμαρεία b, vgl.
unt. Z. 31 | 20 ἐν μοντῷ b τῷ gxy | λουγδούνον gy λογδούνον b λυγδούνον c
λουγδόναν d

Hier. Chron. 26^b — a. Abr. 2368: Gallus Iudeos qui, interfectis per noctem mil-
30 tibus, arma ad rebellandum invaserant oppressit, caesis multis hominum
milibus usque ad innoxiam aetatem, et civitates eorum Diocaesariam
Tiberiadem et Diospolim plurimaque oppida igni tradidit.

28 — a. 355 S. 541, 15: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει Γάλλος ὁ καὶ Κωνστάντιος. Chron. P.
 Καῖσαρ ὅν, ἐκ διαβολῆς, ὡς παρὰ γνώμην Κωνσταντίου τοῦ Αὐγούστου ἀποκτείνας ἔπαρχον πραιτορίων καὶ κυέστωρα, μετασταλεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀντιοχέων ὑπὸ Κωνσταντίου τοῦ Αὐγούστου ἐν Ἰστρῳ τῇ νησῷ
 5 ἀνηρέθη.

Καὶ Ἰουλιανὸν τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ Γάλλου τοῦ καὶ Κωνσταντίου πορφύραν ἐνέδυσεν καὶ Καίσαρα προεχειρίσατο πρὸ ή' ἵδων Ὁκτωβρίων, δοὺς αὐτῷ πρὸς γάμον Κωνστάντιος ὁ Αὔγουστος τὴν ἔκυρτον ἀδελφὴν Ἐλένην, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς ἐν Γαλλίαις.

10 **1—5** vgl. Philostorg. III 28—IV 1 — **6—9** vgl. ebd. IV 2

4 ἐν Ἰστρῳ τῇ νήσῳ vgl. unt. Z. 33 | **7** κέσαρα προεχειρίσατο V | **7/8**
 πρὸ ή' ἵδων ὄκτοβρίων u. am Rand ὄκτωβριων V, vgl. Chron. min. ed. Mommsen I 238 a. 355: *die VIII idus Novemb.* u. Ammian. Marcell. XV 8, 17: *diem octavum iduum Novembris;* Ὁκτωβρίων also ungenaun; vgl. die am Anfang der Passio
 15 Eusignii auf bewahrte richtige Lesart [Lambecius-Kollar Commentar. VIII 222; Text nach guten HSS hergestellt]: Ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπατείας Ἀρβιτίωνος καὶ Ἰουλιανοῦ [st. Λουλλιανοῦ; Variante: διοκλητιανοῦ] ἀνηρέθη Κωνστάντιος ὁ Καῖσαρ καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν Ἰουλιανὸς τῇ πρὸ ὄκτῳ ἵδων Νοεμβρίων | **9** ἐλένην sic V

28^a — S. 45. 5: Ὁ δὲ Κωνστάντιος ὑποστρέψας εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον, Theophan.
 20 παρακληθεὶς ὑπὸ Εὐσεβίας, τῆς ἰδίας γυναικός, Ἰουλιανόν, τὸν ἀδελφὸν Γάλλον, ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς ἔξαγαγὼν Καίσαρα προβάλλεται καὶ εἰς Γαλλίας ἐκπέμπει ζεύξας αὐτῷ πρὸς γάμον καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀδελφὴν Ἐλένην, τὴν καὶ Κωνσταντίαν.

19 βυζάντιον vgl. unt. Z. 27

25 28^b — S. 103, 18: Et paullo post eum (*näml.* Gallum) interfecit Chron. M.
 huiusque in locum constituit Iulianum eius fratrem.

28^c — S. 268, 9: Et ὑποστρέψας εἰς Constant<inopolim> constituit (= προεχειρίσατο?) Iulianum Caesarem et dedit ei uxorem Helenam, Michael sororem suam, quae Constantia appellata est (*freie Übersetzung von*
 30 ζεύξας — Κωνσταντίαν ob. Z. 22 f).

28^d — a. Abr. 2368: Nonnulli nobilium Antiochiae a Gallo interfecti. Hier. Chron.
 a. Abr. 2370: Gallus Caesar sollicitatus a Constantio patrueli, cui
 in suspicionem ob egregiam indolem venerat, Histriae occiditur.
 a. Abr. 2371: Iulianus, frater Galli, Mediolanii Caesar appellatur.

Chron. P. 29 — a. 357 S. 542, 19: Κωνστάντιος Αὔγουστος εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ εἰκοσαετηρίδα μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας καὶ παρατάξεως εἰσῆλθεν ἐν Ἱώμῃ· συνεισῆλθεν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Εὐσεβία ἡ βασίλισσα. καὶ ἐποίησαν ἡμέρας ιδ' ἐν τῇ Ἱώμῃ.

5 30 — a. 359 S. 543, 5: Ἐπὶ τούτων τῶν ὑπάτων μηνὶ Ὑπερβερεταίω μέγας γέγονε καὶ σφοδρὸς σεισμὸς ἐν Νικομηδίᾳ περὶ ὥραν γ' νυκτερινήν, καὶ ἡ πόλις κατέπεσεν καὶ διεφθάρη. ἐν οἷς καὶ συναπώλετο ὁ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως ἐπίσκοπος, Κεκρόπιος τοῦνομα.

31 — a. 360 S. 543, 16: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει μηνὶ Περιτίφ ιε' καθιερώθη
10 ἡ μεγάλη ἐκκλησία Κωνσταντινουπόλεως.

Μακεδόνιος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος καθηρέθη ἐπὶ πολλοῖς ιδίοις αὐτοῦ ἐγκλήμασιν, καὶ κατέστη ἀντ' αὐτοῦ Εὐδόξιος τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπος, ἐνθρονισθεὶς μηνὶ Αὐδυναίῳ κζ' παρουσίᾳ

1 ff vgl. Michael 268, 8. Sozomen. IV 8, 1 u. 11, 3 — **5—8** vgl. Philostorg. IV 10 ob. S. 63, 9 ff. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2374 = Chronic. min. ed. Mommsen I 239 a. 358 — **9 ff** vgl. Philostorg. III 2 u. V 1. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2375 f. Chronic. min. ed. Mommsen I 239 a. 360

1 εἰς τὴν — **2** εἰκοσαετερίδα (sic V) vgl. Chron. min. ed. Mommsen I 239 a. 357 u. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2373 | **2** πολῆς V | **3** εὐσεβείᾳ V | **5** τῶν ὑπάτων näml. **20** Εὐσεβίου καὶ Ὑπατίου = Chron. min. ebd. a. 359 | **5/6** ὑπερβεραιταίῳ u. am Rand ὄκτωβριο V | **6** σφοδρῶς V | **7** διεφθάρει V | **9** u. S. 225, 16 f am Rand φεβρουάριος V | **9/10** καθιερώθη — Κωνσταντινουπόλεως u. S. 225, 15 f ἐπὶ — Μαρτίων = Chron. min. ed. Mommsen I 239 a. 360 | **11** μακεδόνιος V | **13** αὐδυνέω u. am Rand ἰαννουάριος V

Theophan. 29^a — S. 44, 18: Τότε (a. m. 5849) καὶ Σιλβανὸς τυραννήσας ἐν **26** Γαλλίαις ἀνηρέθη ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν Κωνσταντίου. ἐλθὼν δὲ ἐν Ἱώμῃ Κωνστάντιος εἰσῆλθε μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας καὶ παρατάξεως ὀνομασθεὶς ὑπὲρ τοὺς πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ βασιλεῖς· συνῆλθε δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Εὐσεβία, καὶ ἐποίησε ιδ' ἡμέρας ἐν τῇ Ἱώμῃ.

30 30^a — S. 45, 25: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5850) σεισμοῦ μεγάλου γενομένου ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ περὶ ὥραν τρίτην νυκτερινὴν τὴν πόλιν κατέβαλε καὶ πλήθη πολλὰ διέφθειρεν· συναπώλετο δὲ καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς πόλεως Κεκρόπιος.

25 ff vgl. Sozomen. IV 7, 4. Socrat. II 32, 11. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2370 = **35** Eutrop. X 13

25 ff zu notieren, daß hier die Excerptenreihe des Theophan. in Unordnung ist | **30** Τούτῳ τῷ] τῷ αὐτῷ b | **32** κατέβαλε x u. de Boor κατέλαβε bgy

ἐπισκόπων οὗτον, Μάρι, Ἀκεσίου, Γεωργίου, Σέρρα, Οὐρανίου, Θεοδοσίου, Chron. P.
 Εὔσεβίου, Πηγασίου, Λεοντίου, Κυρίωνος, Ἀραβιανοῦ, Ἀσίνου, Φιλοθέου,
 Ἀγερωχίου, Εὐγενίου, Ἐλπιδίου, Στεφάνου, Ἡλιοδώρου, Δημοφίλου,
 Τιμοθέου, Ἐξενρεσίου, Μεγασίου, Μειζωνίου, Παύλου, Εὐαγγρίου,
 5 Ἀπολλωνίου, Φοίβου, Θεοφίλου, Προτασίου, Θεοδώρου, Ἡλιοδώρου,
 Εύμαθίου, Συνεσίου, Πτολεμαίου, Εύτυχῆ, Κύντου, Ἀλφίου, Τροφίμου,
 Εύτυχίου, Βασιλίσκου, Θεομνήστου, Βετρανίωνος, Φιλίππου, Ἀναστασίου,
 Μαξεντίου, Πολυεύκτου, Γρατιανοῦ, Λεοντίου, Μητροδώρου, Εὐσταθίου,
 10 Ιουβιανοῦ, Τροφίμου, Οἰκουμενίου, Μηνοφίλου,
 10 Εὐηθίου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν:

Ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς συνόδου τῶν ἐπισκόπων, οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ἡμέρας
 τοῦ ἐνθρονισθῆναι τὸν Εὐδόξιον ἐπίσκοπον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως,
 τὰ ἐγκαίνια τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως ἐτελέσθη δι'
 ἐτῶν λδ' μικρῷ πρόσω ἀφ' οὐθὲν μελίσσης κατεβάλετο Κωνσταντίνος
 15 νικητὴς σεβαστός. ἐγένετο δὲ τὰ ἐγκαίνια αὐτῆς ἐπὶ τῶν προκειμένων ὑπάτων πρὸ ιεροῦ καλανδῶν Μαρτίων, ἵτις ἐστὶν μηνὸς Περιτίου ιδ'. εἰς τὰ ἐγκαίνια προσήγαγεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Κωνστάντιος Αὔγουστος ἀναθέματα πολλὰ κειμήλια χρυσᾶ καὶ ἀργυρᾶ μεγάλα καὶ
 20 διάλιθα χρυσυφῆ ἀπλώματα τοῦ ἀγίου θυσιαστηρίου πολλά, ἔτι μὴν κοὶ εἰς τὰς θύρας τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀμφίθυρα χρυσᾶ διάφορα, καὶ εἰς τοὺς πυλεῶνας τοὺς ἔξω χρυσυφῆ ποικίλα. καὶ πολλὰς δωρεὰς ἔχαριστα φιλοτίμως τότε παντὶ κλήρῳ καὶ τῷ κανόνι τῶν παρθένων καὶ τῶν χηρῶν καὶ τοῖς ξενοδοχείοις. καὶ εἰς διατροφὴν τῶν προειρημένων καὶ τῶν πτωχῶν καὶ ὄρφανῶν καὶ φυλακῶν σιτομέτριον
 25 προσέθηκεν πλείονος μέτρου οὐπερ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ Κωνσταντίνος ἐχαρίσατο.

11 ff vgl. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2376. Socrat. II 43, 11. Cedren. I 530,
 13 u. 523, 4 — **25 f** vgl. Philostorg. ob. S. 31, 21 f

1 μαριακεσίου V Μάρι, Ἀκακίου du Cange | σέρα V | **1/2** θεοδωσίου· εὐσεβίου V | **5** Φοίβου] φύβου V, s. Register | **6** πτωλεμαίου V | **9** τροφήμου V | **11** οὐ Vc > V | **14** κατεβάλλετο V, corr. Dindorf | **15** ἐπὶ τῶν — 16 ὑπάτων näml. Κωνσταντίου Αὐγούστου τὸ ιερόν καὶ Ιουλιανοῦ Κοίσαρος τὸ γ' — Chron. min., vgl. Anm. zu S. 224, 9/10 | **16** ίε V, s. aber min. 1. 1.: die XV Kal. Mar. u. Socrat. II 43, 11: τῇ πεντεκοιδεκάτῃ τοῦ Φεβρουαρίου μηνός; das Datum ist also ob. S. 224, 9 besser berichtet | **18** κημίλια V | **19** διάληθα χρυσηφῆ V | **19** u. **21** χρυσοῦφη du Cange | **21** χρυσιφῆ V | **22** κανώνι V

Chron. P. 32 — a. 361 S. 545, 7: Ἀρχῆ τετάρτης ἵνδικτιῶνος διὰ τὴν ἀπαγγελθεῖσαν αὐτῷ ἀταξίαν Ἰουλιανοῦ Καίσαρος, ἐλθὼν εἰς Μομψοῦ κρίνας, πρώτη μονῇ ἀπὸ Ταρσοῦ Κιλικίας, καὶ πρότερος εἰληφὼς τὸ ἄγιον βάπτισμα παρὰ Εὐζωίου ἐπισκόπου Ἀντιοχείας μετασταλέντος ἐν τῇ 5 αὐτῇ μονῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Κωνσταντίου, μεταλλάττει τὸν βίον ὁ αὐτὸς Κωνστάντιος Αὔγουστος μηνὶ Δίῳ γ', ἔτους Ἀντιοχείας νι', ἵνδικτιῶνος ε', εἰρήνης τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπιλαβομένου ἔτους ν', τῶν προειρημένων ὑπάτων Ταύρου καὶ Φλωρεντίου.

33 — a. 362 S. 545, 19: Μετὰ τελευτὴν Κωνσταντίου τοῦ Αὔγουστου 10 ἡ εἰρήνη τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν διεκόπη, εἰσελθόντος Ἰουλιανοῦ ἐν Κων-

1 ff vgl. Philostorg. VI 5. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2377 = Chronic. min. ed. Mommsen I 239 f a. 361 u. Eutrop. X 15, 2 — **10 ff** vgl. Chronic. min. ebd.

1 τετάρτης] πέμπτης Scaliger u. du Cange, vgl. Z. 7 | ἵνδικτιόνος V | **2** μομψοῦ κρίνας sic V, vgl. unt. Z. 22 | **3** πρότη V | κηλικίας V | πρότερον du Cange | **4** 15 εὐζωή ||| ου V | **5** μεταλάττει V | **6** μηνιδίο γ u. am Rand νοεμβριοῦ V | **7** εἰρήνης usw., vgl. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2329: *pax nostris a Constantino reddita* | **7/8** προειρημένων näml. Chron. P. 545, 6 = Chronic. min. ed. Mommsen I 239 a. 361

Theophan. 32^a — S. 46, 9: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5852) Πέρσαι τὸ Βεδζάβδη καλούμενον παρέλαβον κάστρον. Κωνστάντιος δὲ ἀκηκοώς ὅτι Ἰου- 20 λιανὸς ἐν Γαλλίαις ἐν πολέμοις εὐδοκιμήσας ὑπὸ τοῦ στρατοῦ βασιλεὺς ἀνηγορεύθη, ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ διάγων διὰ τὸν Περσικὸν πόλεμον, ἔξωρ- μησε κατὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ τυράννου. καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐν Μαμψουκρήναις, πρώτῃ μονῇ ἀπὸ Ταρσοῦ τῆς Κιλικίας, ἐτελεύτησε μηνὶ Δίῳ γ'.

18 βεδζάβδη b βεδζακδί x βεδζάκδι f βεδζάκιδι em βεδζαηδί g; vgl. Hier. 25 Chron. a. Abr. 2363: *nam, ut alia omittam, . . . Bizabde et Amida captae sunt* | **22** ἐμαψουκρίναισ b ἐν μομψουκρίναισ d ἐμμονψουκρία g | **23** πρότημον ἡ b

Chron. M. 32^b — S. 103, 19: Bellum gessit Iulianus adversus Gothos eosque vicit, et rebellavit adversus Constantium regnavitque in Hispania et Gallia. in eum se paravit ad bellum Constantius; cum autem ascenderet ex 30 Oriente ad praelium cum eo ineundum, recubuit in lecto quietis sua et mortuus est anno sescentesimo septuagesimo tertio mense Τεστί posteriore. regnavit autem Constantius annos viginti quattuor. S. 103, 32: <Et mortuus est Constantius> anno sescentesimo septuagesimo tertio mense Τεστί posteriore. regnavit autem annos XXIV. et fecit pulchrum coram 35 domino, et ambulavit in viis Constantini patris sui. id est arianus fuit. Et potitus est regno eius post eum Iulianus, cum iam pax *

30 ff vgl. Michael 269, 6

σταντινουπόλει μηνὶ Ἀπηλαίῳ ια' καὶ ἔστιν τὰ παρακολουθήσαντα Chron. P.
 ταῦτα· Ἰουλιανὸς γνοὺς τὴν Κωνσταντίου τοῦ Αύγουστου τελευτήν, τὴν
 ἐαυτοῦ ἀποστασίαν καὶ ἀσέβειαν φανερὰν καθιστῶν, διατάγματα κατὰ
 τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀποστέλλων τὰ εἴδωλα
 5 πάντα ἀνανεοῦσθαι προσέταττεν. ἐφ' οἵς ἐπαρθέντες οἱ κατὰ τὴν
 Ἀνατολὴν Ἐλληνες εὐθέως ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ τῇ κατ' Αἴγυπτον Γεώρ-
 γιον τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τῆς πόλεως συλλαβόμενοι ἀνείλον καὶ τὸ λείψανον
 αὐτοῦ ἀσεβῶς ἐνύβρισαν· καμήλῳ γάρ ἐπιθέντες δι' ὅλης τῆς πόλεως
 10 περιέφερον, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο διαφόρων ἀλόγων νεκρὰ σώματα μετὰ
 τῶν ὁστέων συναγαγόντες καὶ συμμίξαντες αὐτοῦ τῷ λειψάνῳ καὶ
 κατακαύσαντες διεσκόρπισαν.

2—11 vgl. Philostorg. VII 1 f. Sozomen. V 7, 2 f. Socrat. III 2, 10. Epiphan.
 Haeres. 76 PG 42, 516 C

1 ἀπηλαίῳ u. am Rand δεκεμβριῳ V | 4 vor τὰ + καὶ ausradiert V |
 15 7 ἀνείλων V | 9 τούτῳ V

33^a — S. 47, 16: Τότε οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀνατολὴν Ἐλληνες ἐπαρθέντες Theophan.
 εὐθέως ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Γεώργιον τὸν ἐπίσκοπον σύροντες ἀνείλον,
 καὶ τὸ λείψανον αὐτοῦ ἀθέως ἐνύβριζοντες καὶ καμήλῳ ἐπιθέντες
 ἐπόμπευνον διὰ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ μετὰ νεκρῶν ἀλόγων ὁστέων μίξαντες
 20 αὐτοῦ τὸ λείψανον κατέκαυσαν καὶ διεσκόρπισαν.

33^b — Theophylact. Bulgar. Passio XV Martyrum 13 PG 126, 169
 A 7: Τίς γὰρ λόγος ἔξαριθμήσαιτο ἡ καθ' ἐκάστην χώραν οἱ τῷ τυράννῳ
 ὑπηρετούμενοι τοῖς Χριστοῦ δούλοις ἐπεδείκνυντο; ὅπου γε καὶ τὸν
 ἐπίσκοπον Ἀλεξανδρείας Γεώργιον σύροντες διὰ τῆς πλατείας
 25 ἀπέκτειναν, εἶτα καμήλῳ ἐπιτιθέντες καὶ τὰ τῶν μελῶν σπα-
 ράγματα θριαμβεύσαντες καὶ τέλος τῇ καμήλῳ συγκατακαύσαντες
 αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ λείψανα τῆς τέφρας διέσπειραν.

33^c — Ebd. Folge: Et anno quinquagesimo secundo pacis ecclesiis Chron. M.
 <concessae> stetit in universum imperium Romanorum Iulianus. et reno-
 30 vavit persecutionem adversus Christianos, iussitque templa idolorum
 aperiri et aras eorum refici et idola restitu eorumque ministerium
 instaurari. abstulit ecclesiarum thesauros et mandavit constitui conventicula
 falsarum doctrinarum misitque episcopos in exilium e sedibus eorum.

33^d — a. Abr. 2378: Iuliano ad idolorum cultum converso, blanda per-
 35 secutio fuit inliciens magis quam inpellens ad sacrificandum, in qua
 multi ex nostris voluntate propria corruerunt [vgl. unt. S. 232f].

Georgio per seditionem populi incenso, qui in locum Athanasii ab
 Arrianis fuerat ordinatus, Athanasius Alexandriam revertitur.

Chron. P. Καὶ ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ δὲ τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ τὰ λείψανα ἐν Σεβαστῇ τῇ πόλει κείμενα ἀνορύζαντες διεσκόρπισαν.

"Ετι δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἀγίου Πατροφίλου ἐπισκόπου τῆς ἐν Σκυθοπόλει ἐκκλησίας γενομένου ἀνορύζαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ τάφου τὰ λείψανα, τὰ μὲν 5 ἄλλα διεσκόρπισαν, τὸ δὲ κρανίον ἐφυβρίστως κρεμάσαντες ώς ἐν σχήματι κανδήλας ἐνέπαιξαν.

'Ἐν δὲ Γάζῃ καὶ Ἀσκάλωνι πρεσβυτέρους καὶ παρθένους ἀναιροῦντες καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἀναπτύσσοντες καὶ τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν κριθῶν πληρώσαντες τοῖς χοίροις παρέβαλον.

10 Καὶ ἐν Φοινίκῃ δὲ Κύριλλον διάκονον Ἡλιουπολίτην ἀνελόντες τοῦ ἥπατος αὐτοῦ ἀπεγεύσαντο, ἐπειδὴ τὰ εἴδωλα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ μακαρίου Κωνσταντίνου κατέστρεψεν. ὁ δὲ ἀνατεμὰν τὸν διάκονον καὶ ἀπογευσάμενος τοῦ ἥπατος αὐτοῦ, ὅπως κατέστρεψε τὸν ἑαυτοῦ βίον, ἄξιον ἐπιμνησθῆναι· τὴν μὲν γλῶσσαν σαπεῖσαν ἀπώλεσεν, τοὺς

15 **1 f** vgl. Philostorg. VII 4. Theodoret H. E. III 7, 2. Rufin H. E. XI 28 — **7 ff** vgl. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. IV 87 u. V 29. Theodoret H. E. III 7, 1. Sozomen. V 10, 6 — **10**—S. 229, 3 vgl. Theodoret H. E. III 7, 2 ff

6 ἐνέπαιξαν V ἐνέπηξαν du Cange, aber vgl. unt. Z. 21

Theophan. 33^e — S. 47, 25: Τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀγίου Πατροφίλου, τοῦ ἐν Σκυθοπόλει 20 ἐπισκόπου, λείψανα ἀνορύζαντες, τὰ μὲν ὄλλα διεσκόρπισαν, τὸ δὲ κρανίον ἐφυβρίστως κρεμάσαντες ἐνέπαιξον.

'Ἐν δὲ Γάζῃ καὶ Ἀσκάλωνι πρεσβυτέρους καὶ ἀειπαρθένους ἀναιροῦντες ἀνέπτυσσον τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτῶν, καὶ κριθῶν πληροῦντες τοῖς χοίροις παρέβαλον.

25 Εἰν δὲ Φοινίκῃ Κύριλλον διάκονον Ἡλιουπολίται ἀνελόντες τοῦ ἥπατος αὐτοῦ ἀπεγεύσαντο, ἐπειδὴ τὰ εἴδωλα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ μακαρίου Κωνσταντίνου κατέστρεψεν. ὁ δὲ ἀνατεμὰν τὸν διάκονον καὶ ἀπογευσάμενος τοῦ ἥπατος αὐτοῦ πέπονθε ταῦτα· τὴν μὲν γλῶσσαν

30 **19** ἀγίου b> gxy, vgl. ob. Z. 3 | **22** ἀσκάλων b ἀσκαλῶνι y | **24** παρέ- βαλλον csgm

33^f — Theophylact. Bulgar. ebd. Folge PG 126, 169 A 15: "Αλλῳ δὲ σπλάγχνων (σπλάγχνοις Cod.) ἀνασχισθέντων κριθὸς ἐπισπείραντες εἶτα χοίρους ἐπαφέντες τοιαύτῃ τραπέζῃ τούτους είστιάσαντο (ἐστιάσαντο Cod.)."

δὲ ὁδόντας θρυβέντας ἀπέβαλεν, τοὺς δὲ ὄφθαλμοὺς ἐπὶ πολὺ καὶ σφοδρότερον ὁδυνηθεὶς ἐπηρώθη, καὶ δι' ὅλου τοῦ σώματος βασανίζομενος δεινῶς ἀπέθανεν.

'Ἐν δὲ Ἐμίσῃ τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπελθόντες τὸ τοῦ Διονύσου 5 εἰδωλον ἴδρυσαν.

4 f vgl. Theodoret H. E. III 7, 5

2 σφοδρότερον V | **4** ἐμίση V | **5** εἴδρυσαν V

σαπεῖσαν κατέρρευσε καὶ τοὺς ὁδόντας ἀπέβαλε καὶ τοὺς ὄφθαλμοὺς Theophan. ἐπηρώθη, καὶ οὕτω βασανίζομενος ἀπέθανεν.

10 33^g — S. 48,8: 'Ἐν δὲ Ἀρεθούσῃ φοβερὰ κατὰ Χριστιανῶν διεπράξατο. ἐν οἷς καὶ Μάρκον τὸν ἀγιώτατον μοναχόν, τὸν καὶ σώσαντα καὶ κρύψαντα Ἰουλιανὸν ἐν τῷ ἀνελεῖν τὸν στρατὸν τὸ γένος Κωνσταντίου, τούτου τὰ σπλάγχνα ζῶντος *

'Ἐν Ἐμέσῃ ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ τὸ τοῦ Διονύσου εἰδωλον 15 ἴδρυσεν, τὴν δὲ παλαιὰν ἐκκλησίαν κατέστρεψεν.

10—13 vgl. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. IV 88—91. Theodoret H. E. III 7, 6ff. Sozomen. V 10, 8—14

33^h — Theophylact. Bulgar. ebd. PG 126, 165 BC: 'Αλλὰ καὶ εἱ (οἱ Cod.) κάν τινες ἐπὶ Κωνσταντίου ἦ ναὸν καθεῖλον εἰδωλικὸν ἥ στήλην 20 εἰδωλικὴν κατέαξαν, τούτους ἥ τὰ καθαιρεθέντα ἀνοικοδομεῖν (näml. ὁ Ἰουλιανὸς προστάττει) καὶ τὰ κατεαγότα καινουργεῖν ἥ πικραὶς τιμωρίαις καὶ θανατώδεσι δίκαις καὶ ποιναῖς ὑποβάλλεσθαι· ἐν οἷς ἦν καὶ Μάρκος ὁ Ἀρεθούσιος. ὅς, τῶν σεσωκότων <τὸν> ἔξαγιστον (ἔξαγιστων Cod.) εἵς ὧν ὁ πηνίκα τὸ σύμπαν αὐτοῦ γένος σφαγῇ 25 παρεδίδοτο, ναὸν μὲν καθεῖλεν εἰδωλικόν· ἀνεγεῖραι δὲ τοῦτον ἀναγκαζόμενος, ἐπεὶ μὴ ὑπήκουεν, ἄλλας τε δεινὰς καὶ πολλὰς τιμωρίας ὑπέστη καὶ τέλος παισὶν ἐκ παίδων μετέωρος ἀνεπέμπετο γραφίοις ὑποδεχομένοις τὸ γηραλέον ἐκείνου σῶμα τὸ τίμιον, καὶ γῆς ὅντως καὶ τῶν τῆς γῆς ὑψηλότερος.

18—22 vgl. Liban. Orat. XVIII 126. Zonar. XIII 12, 31 f. Asmus, Wochenschr. f. klass. Philol. 1899, 741

Chron. P. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἐπιφανείᾳ πόλει τῆς Συρίας ἐπελθόντες οἱ Ἑλληνες τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ εἰδωλον εἰσήγαγον μετὰ αὐλῶν καὶ τυμπάνων· ὁ δὲ μακάριος Εὐστάθιος, ὁ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπος τυγχάνων, ἀνὴρ εὐλαβῆς καὶ εὐσεβῆς, ἀκούσας τῶν αὐλῶν καὶ πυθόμενος τὸ ποῦ 5 ἀν εἴη ταῦτα καὶ γνοὺς ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ζῆλον ἔχων ἐν πίστει καὶ εὐλαβείᾳ, ἀθρόως ἀκούσας ἐκοιμήθη, προσευξάμενος μὴ ἵδειν ταῦτα τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὄφθαλμοῖς.

"Ετι δὲ καὶ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐπιβὰς ὁ Ἰουλιανός, Εύδοξίου τε ἐπισκόπου ἐν αὐτῇ ὄντος, πολυτρόπως κατὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας μηχα-
10 νώμενος ἐπιβουλάζεις, εἰς σύγχυσιν καὶ τὰ κατ' αὐτὴν ἥγαγεν, βουληθεὶς ἄπαντας τοὺς καθαιρεθέντας πρὸ τούτου ἐπὶ διαφόροις ἀτόποις κακο-
δοξίαις ἐπαφεῖναι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, προφάσεις ἐκ τῶν γινομένων τα-
ραχῶν ἐπινοῶν κατὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Οὕτως οὖν καὶ Μελέτιος, ὁ ἐπὶ ἀσεβείᾳ καὶ ἑτέροις κακοῖς καθη-
15 ρημένος, ἐπανελθὼν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τὴν παλαιὰν ἥρπασεν ἐκκλησίαν,
συνδραμόντων αὐτῷ καὶ τῶν ἡδη ἐκ τοῦ κλήρου καθαιρεθέντων
ἐνθέσμως ὑπὸ τῆς ἀγίας συνόδου· ἐν οἷς ἦν μάλιστα καὶ Διογένης,
ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων, τῶν ἄλλων πλειόνων συντρέχων, καὶ Βιτάλιος λαϊκὸς
ἐν ἐπιθέσει ἀεὶ ζῆσας καὶ δὴ ἀπὸ πολλοῦ προϊών, καὶ ὑστερον λυ-
20 πηθεὶς μετὰ χρόνον πρὸς τὸν Μελέτιον ἀπεσχίσθη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ
αἵρεσιν γέλωτος καὶ αὐτὴν ἀξίαν οὖσαν συνεστήσατο· ἀφ' οὗ ἄχρι
τοῦ νῦν Βιταλιανοὶ λέγονται.

Ταύτη τῇ αἵρεσι καὶ Ἀπολινάριος ὁ Λαοδικεὺς τῆς Συρίας,
γραμματικοῦ νιὸς γεγονώς, προέστη.

8 ff vgl. Philostorg. ob. S. 81, 8 ff. Sozomen. V 5, 7 — **14 f** vgl. Philostorg.
V 5 — **18 ff** vgl. Theodoret H. E. V 4, 1. Sozomen. VI 25, 1 f

1 ἐπελθόντες V | **12** ἐπαφή ||| νε (νε auf Rasur V^c) V | **22** βιτιλιανοὶ V
23 ὁ Λαοδικεὺς du Cange ώσ δολαΐκευσ V

34 — S. 48, 27: Δωρόθεον δέ, τὸν πολύαθλον ἐπίσκοπον Τύρου, Theophan.
 τὸν πολλὰς ἱστορίας γράψαντα ἐκκλησιαστικάς καὶ ἐν λόγοις διαπρέ-
 ποντα, τὸν ἐπὶ Διοκλητιανοῦ ὁμολογητὴν γεγονότα καὶ αὐθίς ἐπὶ
 Λικινίου, ἐν γήρᾳ βαθεῖ φθάσαντα ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ χρόνῳ τοῦ παρα-
 5 βάτου οἱ τούτου ἄρχοντες ἐν Ὁδυσσοπόλει τοῦτον εὔρόντες ἰδιάσαντα,
 πολλοὺς αἰκισμοὺς διὰ τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν πίστιν ἐπαγαγόντες ἐθανά-
 τωσαν αὐτὸν ρζ' χρόνων ὑπάρχοντα.

35 — S. 49, 28: Ιουλιανὸς δὲ διάγων ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ καὶ συνεχῶς ἐν
 Δάφνῃ ἀνιών καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος θεραπεύων εἰδώλον οὐδεμιᾶς
 10 ἀποκρίσεως, ὡς φέτο, ἐτύγχανεν ὑπὸ τοῦ εἰδώλου. νοήσας δὲ ὅτι
 διὰ τὰ ἀποκείμενα ἐν τῇ Δάφνῃ λείψανα τοῦ ἀγίου μάρτυρος Βαβυλᾶ
 ἀποσιωπᾷ τὸ εἰδώλον, δόγμα ἐξέπεμψε πάντα τὰ ἀποκείμενα ἐκεὶ
 τῶν νεκρῶν λείψανα μετατεθῆναι σὺν τοῖς τοῦ μάρτυρος· καὶ τούτου
 γενομένου ἀθρόως τῇ νυκτὶ κατεφλέχθη οὐρανόθεν ὁ ναός, τὸ δὲ
 15 εἰδώλον οὕτω κατεκάη, ὥστε μηδὲ ἵχνος αὐτοῦ φανῆναι (ἐλέγετε δὲ
 πρὸ ἐτῶν ἐστηκέναι), ὁ δὲ ναὸς οὕτω κατεριπώθη, ὥστε τοὺς μετέ-
 πειτα ὄρᾶν τὴν τούτου τέφρωσιν καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι
 τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ παραδοξοποιίας. ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἔκθαμβος γενόμενος
 Ιουλιανός, ὑπονοήσας κατ' ἐπιβουλὴν τῶν Χριστιανῶν τοῦτο γενέ-

20 1—7 vgl. Niceph. H. E. X 9 PG 146, 465 C 2. Theophan. 24, 20, Synax.
 124, 20 u. 731 11. Indic. apostolor. Ps. Dorothei bei Prophetarum Vitae ed. Scher-
 mann S. 132 f — 8 — S. 232, 17 vgl. Philostorg. VII 8. Zonar. XIII 12, 85—43.
 Theodoret H. E. III 10 ff. Sozomen. V 19 f

25 4 λικινίου egm | γῆρει b vgl. unt. Z. 33 | 5 ὁδυστωπόλει b, Ἐδέσῃ unt.
 Z. 32 falsch; vgl. Synax. 731 f [u. 124, 29: κατέλαβε τὴν Θράκην], Theophan.
 24, 30 u. Indic. apost. Ps. Dorothei 1. 1. S. 133, 3 | 11 ὑποκείμενα b | βαβύλα bfm

34^a — Theophylact. Bulgar. ebd. PG 126, 169 B 2 [unmittelbar nach
 ἐστιάσαντο ob. S. 228, 34]: Ἐν Τύρῳ δὲ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ταύτης
 Δωρόθεον, ὃς πολὺς (πολλοῖς Cod.) ἐν λόγοις καὶ συγγραφεὺς ἱστορι-
 30 κώτατος τῶν πάλαι ὁ ἀνὴρ γέγονεν, ὃς καὶ ἐπὶ Διοκλητιανού καὶ
 Λικινίου ὑπὲρ τὰ ἔξηκοντα ἔτη γεγονὼς πολλαῖς ἡτάσθη ταῖς ὑπὲρ
 Χριστοῦ τιμωρίαις, τοῦτον ἐν Ἐδέσῃ τῇ πόλει οἱ τῆς πίστεως ἐχθροὶ
 ἐν γῆρει (γύρει Cod.) πίονι πληθυνθέντα ὡς (ῷ Cod.) φησιν ὁ θεῖος Δανύδ
 [Psal. 91, 15] (ἐτῶν γὰρ ἦν ἑκατὸν ἐπτὰ ὁ ὄγιος) θανάτῳ παρέδωκαν

35 34^b — S. 289, 17: Dorotheum Tyrium qui fecit librum ἐκκλησιαστικὸν
 et in diebus Diocletiani et Licinii ἄθλους πολλοὺς subiit, hoc tempore
 ἐθανάτωσαν αὐτὸν pagani ὑπάρχοντα ρζ' annorum. Michael

Chron. P. 36 — a. 363 S. 548, 12: Ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ τῶν ἐν στρατείαις ἔξεταζομένων τινὲς ἡπατήθησαν εἰς ἀποστασίαν, οἱ μὲν ἐπαγγελίαις δόσεων καὶ ἀξιωμάτων, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἀνάγκαις ταῖς ἐπιτιθεμέναις ὑπὸ τῶν ἴδιων ἀρχόντων χαυνούμενοι.

5 Καὶ Θεότεκνος δέ τις πρεσβύτερος τῆς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἐκκλησίας

1 ff vgl. Theophylact. Bulgar. unt. S. 234, 31 ff. Hier. Chron. ob. S. 227, 34 ff. Theodoret H. E. III 16, 7. Sozomen. V 17, 8 ff. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. IV 81 ff. Rufin H. E. X 33 — 5 — S. 233, 10 vgl. Philostorg. VII 13

3 ἐπ^{τι}θεμέναις V

Theophan. σθαι, ἐπὶ ἔξετασιν τῶν παραμενόντων ιερέων ἔχώρει, καὶ παντοίαις

11 βασάνοις αὐτοὺς ὑποβαλών, ώς καὶ ἀποθανεῖν ἔξ αὐτῶν, τοῦτο μόνον ἦκουσε παρ' αὐτῶν, ὅτι οὕτε ὑπὸ Χριστιανῶν, οὕτε ἀπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἐπιβουλῆς τοῦτο γέγονεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πῦρ κατελθὸν ἐνέπρησε τὸν νοὰν καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα· ώς καὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ τισὶ φανῆναι 15 ἐν τῇ ἀγροικίᾳ τὸ πῦρ καταφερόμενον. θυμωθεὶς οὖν ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὥσπερ τῷ θεῷ μαχόμενος τὴν μεγάλην ἐκκλησίαν ἀπέκλεισε καὶ πάντα τὰ ιερὰ ἐδήμευσεν. τῶν δὲ ἀποσταλέντων ἐπὶ τούτῳ κομήτων δύο, Φίλικος καὶ Ἰουλιανὸς ἀποστατῶν, ἔλεγον ταῦτα· »ἐνομίζομεν ἐποπτικήν τινα εἶναι δύναμιν τὴν ὀφείλουσαν ἡμᾶς κωλῦσαι«. ὁ δὲ 20 Φίλιξ· »ἴδε εἰς ποταπὰ σκεύη ὑπηρετεῖτο ὁ υἱὸς Μαρίας«. καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον ὁ μὲν Φίλιξ ἀθρόως διὰ στόματος αἷμα ἀναγαγών, βασανιζόμενος κατέστρεψε τὸν βίον· Ἰουλιανὸς δὲ ὁ κόμης κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἡμέραν νόσῳ χαλεπωτάτῃ περιπεσών, ώς καὶ τὰ ἐντὸς αὐτοῦ διαφθαρῆναι καὶ κόπρον διὰ στόματος ἀναγαγεῖν, βασανιζόμενος ἀπέθανεν.

25 36^a — S. 50, 34: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5855) τινὲς ἡπατήθησαν τῶν ἐν στρατείαις ἔξεταζομένων πρὸς ἀποστασίαν, οἱ μὲν ἐπαγγελίαις δόσεων καὶ ἀξιωμάτων, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἀνάγκαις ἐπιτιθεμέναις ὑπὸ τῶν ἴδιων ἀρχόντων.

Καὶ Θεότεκνος πρεσβύτερος ἐν προαστείῳ Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἐκκλησίαν

30 17—24 vgl. Philostorg. VII 10. Theodoret H. E. III 12 f. Sozomen. V 8

26 στρατείαισι g wie ob. Z. 1 στρατίαισι b στρατεία xy

Hier. Chron. 35^a [Vgl. ob. Z. 16] — a. Abr. 2379: Ecclesia Antiochiae clausa.

Michael 36^b — S. 289, 22: Theotecnus πρεσβύτερος ἡπατήθη et sacrificavit et παραχρῆμα scatuit vermisbus, et τὴν γλῶσσαν eius ederunt et ἀπέθανεν

ἐξ ὑποσχέσεως ἀπατηθεὶς αὐτομάτως ἐπὶ τὴν εἰδωλολατρείαν ἐχώ- Chron. P.
ρησεν· ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἐτιμωρήσατο παραχρῆμα τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ· σκω-
ληκόβρωτος γὰρ γενόμενος καὶ τὰς ὄψεις ἀποβαλὼν καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν
ἐσθίων, οὕτως ἀπέθανεν.

5 Τότε καὶ Ἡρων οὕτω λεγόμενός τις Θηβαῖος ἐπίσκοπος αὐτο-
μάτως ἀπέστη ἐν τῇ Ἀντιοχέων πόλει τυγχάνων, ὃν ἡ παραδοξοποιὸς
τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμις εἰς παράδειγμα καὶ φόβον πολλῶν τιμωρίας εἰσεπρά-
ξατο. ἔρημον γὰρ αὐτὸν καταστήσας πάσης κηδεμονίας καὶ σηπεδόνος
νόσου ἐμβαλὼν, ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις φερόμενον ἐκψύξαι δημοσίᾳ ἐνωπιον
10 πάντων ἐποίησεν.

Ἐν τούτοις καὶ Οὐαλεντινιανός, τριβοῦνος τότε ὧν τάγματος
κορνούτων οὕτω λεγομένῳ νουμέρῳ, τῇ εἰς Χριστὸν όμολογίᾳ
διέπρεπεν. οὐ μόνον γὰρ τοῦ ἀξιώματος κατεφρόνησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ

2 f vgl. Act. 12, 23 — 11—S. 234, 3 vgl. Philostorg. VII 7. Theodoret
15 H. E. III 16, 1—4. Sozomen. VI 6, 4 ff

1/2 ἀνεχώρησεν V in ἐχώρησεν corr. V^c | **2** ἐτιμωρίσατο V | **2/3** σκωλι-
κόβρωτος V | **5** ἥρων V | **6** παραδοξωποιὸς V | **7/8** εἰσεπράξαντο, υ απα-
radiert, V | **8** κηδαιμονίας V | **9** φερόμενον V | **11** ὃν V | **12** λεγομενων
νουμέρου Theophan. unt. Z. 29/30, besser | εἰς χῶν auf Rasur V^c

20 πεπιστευμένος ἐξ ὑποσχέσεως ἀπατηθεὶς αὐτομάτως ἐπὶ τὴν εἰδωλο-
λατρείαν ἐχώρησεν· ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἐτιμωρήσατο παραχρῆμα. σκωληκό-
βρωτος γὰρ γενόμενος καὶ τὰς ὄψεις ἀποβαλὼν, τὴν γλῶσσαν ἐσθίων
ἀπέθανεν.

Καὶ Ἡρων, ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Θηβαΐδος, αὐτομάτως ἀπεστάτησεν ἐν
25 τῇ Ἀντιοχέων πόλει, ὃν ὁ θεὸς παρευθὺν εἰς παράδειγμα καὶ φόβον
πολλῶν ἐτιμωρήσατο οὕτως· σηπεδόνος νοσήματι διαλυθέντων αὐτοῦ
τῶν μελῶν ἐν τῇ πλατείᾳ ἔρριμμένος ἐν ὁφθαλμοῖς πάντων ἐξέψυξεν.

‘Αλλ’ ἐν τούτοις διέπρεψαν όμολογίᾳ τῇ εἰς Χριστὸν Οὐαλεν-
τινιανός, τριβοῦνος τότε ὧν τάγματος, κορνούτων λεγομένων νου-
30 μέρουν, οὐ μόνον τοῦ ἀξιώματος καταφρονήσας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξορίᾳ

28 ἀλλ’ ἐν bc ἄλλοι δὲ ἐν dgy | 29 κορνούτων de Boor wie ob. Z. 12
κορνώτων c κορνωτῶν berm^f κορωνάτων g

36^c Theophylact. Bulgar. ebd. 10 PG 126, 165 CD [unmittelbar
nach ὑψηλότερος ob. S. 229, 29]: Τὰς δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας κοινῶς καθαι-
35 ρεῖσθαι προσέταξεν, καὶ μήτε μαθημάτων Ἑλληνικῶν μετέχειν Χριστια-
νοὺς (χριστιανὸς Cod.) μήτε ἀξιωμάτων συγκλητικῶν. πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν
ἡδέως τὰς ζώνας αὐτῶν ἀπεβάλλοντο, πάντα σκύβαλα ἡγησά-

35 vgl. Philostorg. VII 4^b

Chron. P. ἐξορίᾳ ὑποβληθεὶς γενναίως καὶ προθύμως ὑπέμενεν. ὃς μετὰ ταῦτα ὅπως ἐτιμήθη ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, βασιλεὺς Ῥωμαίων γενόμενος, ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς δηλωθήσεται.

Αρτέμιος δὲ δοὺξ ὧν τῆς κατ' Αἴγυπτον διοικήσεως, ἐπειδήπερ 5 ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀρχῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ μακαρίτου Κωνσταντίου τοῦ Αὐγούστου ζῆλον πολὺν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐνεδείξατο ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρεών, ἐδημεύθη καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπετμήθη, μνησικακήσαντος αὐτὸν τοῦ Ἰουλιανοῦ.

Ἐμαρτύρησεν δὲ καὶ ἐν Δωροστόλῳ τῆς κατὰ τὴν Θράκην Σκυθίας 10 Αἰμιλιανὸς ἀπὸ στρατιωτῶν, πυρὶ παραδοθεὶς ὑπὸ Καπετολίνου οὐικαρίου· πολλοί τε ἄλλοι κατὰ διαφόρους τόπους καὶ πόλεις καὶ

2 f vgl. unt. S. 238, 18 f — **4—8** vgl. ob. Anhang I u. III. Theodoret H. E. III 18, 1 Zonar. XIII 12, 44. Cedren. I 537, 4 — **9 f** vgl. Theodoret H. E. II 17, 5. Synax. 827, 2. Acta Sanct. Iul. IV 373. Martyrol. Hieronym. XV kal. August.

15 **1** ὃς Dindorf ὡς V | **4** ἀρτέμιδος, δ ausradiert, V | **9** σκυθίας V, Μυσίας Synax. 827, 3 | **10** αἰμηλιανὸς V

Theophan. ὑποβληθείς, ὅστις μετὰ ταῦτα ὑπὸ θεοῦ βασιλεὺς ἀνεδείχθη· ὄμοιώς καὶ Ἰουβιανὸς τὴν ζώνην ἔλυσε κράζων· »Χριστιανός εἰμι«. ὃν ὁ λαὸς ἀγαπῶν στρατοπεδάρχην ὅντα ἐξητήσατο τὸν βασιλέα μὴ 20 ἀδικῆσαι αὐτὸν· ὅστις καὶ βασιλεὺς μετὰ Ἰουλιανὸν ἀνηγορεύθη.

Αρτέμιος τε, ὃ δοὺξ τῆς κατ' Αἴγυπτον διοικήσεως, ἐπειδήπερ ἐπὶ Κωνσταντίου ζῆλον κατὰ τῶν εἰδώλων πολὺν ἐνεδείξατο ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, ἐδημεύθη τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθείς.

Ἐμαρτύρησεν δὲ καὶ ἐν Δωροστόλῳ τῆς Θράκης Αἰμιλιανὸς ἀπὸ 25 στρατιωτῶν, πυρὶ παραδοθεὶς ὑπὸ Καπετωλίνου· καὶ πολλοί ἄλλοι

18 ιωβιανὸς d | **19** ἐξετήσατο b ἐξητήσαντο dg | **22/23** vgl. Cedren. ob. S. 176, 22 ff | **24** δοροστόλῳ d δωροστόλῳ bց δօրօտոլու y | **23** καπετωλίνου d καπετουλιανοῦ die übr. HSS

Theophylact. μενοὶ ἴνα Χριστὸν μόνον κερδήσωσιν [Phil. 3, 8]. οὗος ἦν 30 Ιοβιανὸς καὶ Οὐαλεντινιανός, οἵς δὴ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν ὁ θεὸς κατὰ τοὺς ἰδίους ἐκατέροις (ἐκατέρους Cod.) καιροὺς παραδέδωκε. πολλοὶ δὲ τῇ τῇ κενῆς δόξης ἐπιθυμίᾳ τὸν ἀληθινὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστὸν ἐξωμόσαντο.

31 ff vgl. ob. S. 232, 1 ff

Hier. Chron. 36^d — a. Abr. 2379: Aemilianus (*sic* AON) ob ararum subversionem 35 Dorostori (*sic* AONPM) a vicario incenditur.

χώρας διέπρεψαν τῇ εἰς Χριστὸν ὄμολογίᾳ. ὃν οὐκ ἔστιν ράδιον τὸν Chron. P. ἀριθμὸν ἔξειπεῖν καὶ τὰ ὄνόματα.

Ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ Θαλάσσιος τις, ὁ καὶ Μάγνος, ἐν ἀσελγείαις μὲν καὶ ἀσωτίαις ἐπίσημος, ὁ καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ θυγατρὸς ἐπ’ αἰσχρουρ- 5 γίας προαγωγὲνς ἐτύγχανεν, συμπεσόντος αὐτῷ τοῦ οἴκου ἀπέθανεν.

4 ἀσωτείαις ἐπίσημος V | ὥ] ὃς Dindorf, oder ist ἐτύγχανεν zu tilgen? vgl. unt. Z. 10 f | **4/5** ἐπεσχρουργείαις προαγωγὲνς V | 5 συνπεσόντος V.

κατὰ διαφόρους τόπους καὶ τρόπους διέπρεψαν ἐν τῇ εἰς Χριστὸν Theophan. ὄμολογίᾳ.

10 Θαλάσσιος δέ τις ἐπ’ ἀσελγείαις καὶ ἀσωτίαις ἐπίσημος, ὁ καὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ θυγατρὸς ἐπ’ αἰσχρουρίᾳ προαγωγὲνς, ἐτιμάτο ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ὡς σπλαγχνοσκόπος, οἰκῶν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ πλησίον τοῦ πα- λατίου. συμπεσόντος οὖν αὐτῷ τοῦ οἴκου μόνος ἀπώλετο μετὰ ἐνὸς εὐνούχου, ὃ καὶ συμπεπλεγμένος εὑρέθη. ἐσώθησαν δὲ πάντες οἱ 15 σὺν αὐτῷ εὑρεθέντες, οἵ ᾧ ιδιοί αὐτοῦ Χριστιανοὶ ὅντες, ἣ τε τούτου γυνὴ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῇ παιδίον δὲ ὡς ἐτῶν ἐπτὰ ἐκεῖ εὑρεθὲν καὶ σωθέν, ἐρωτώμενον πᾶς ἐσώθη, εἴρηκεν ως ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου βασταχθέν.

Ο δὲ δυσώνυμος Ἰουλιανὸς ἐπ’ ἀνατροπῇ τῆς θείας ἀποφάσεως τὸν Ἰουδαίων ναὸν οἰκοδομηθῆναι προσέταξεν, Ἀλύπιον Ἐλληνά τινα 20 σπουδαῖον κατὰ Χριστοῦ προστησάμενος τοῦ ἔργου. τοῦ δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀφανῆ τῶν θεμελίων κατορύζαντος, διὰ τὸν ἐκχοϊσμὸν ἄνεμος βιαιό- τατος ἐπιπνεύσας σὺν λαίλαπι τὴν παρεσκευασμένην ἄσβεστον ἐξηφά- νισε μοδίων μυριάδων κ’ οὖσαν· ἐπιμενόντων δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῇ

18—S. 236, 15 vgl. Theodoret H. E. III 20 f — **18**—S. 236, 2 vgl. Philo-
25 storg. VII 9 — **18** Matth. 24, 2. Mark. 13, 2. Luk. 19, 44 u. 21, 6

8 καὶ τρόπους > egm | **13** αὐτῷ > b | **14** οἱ — **15** εὑρεθέντες > gy | **14—15** πάντες δὲ οἱ διαφέροντες αὐτῷ ἐσώθησαν, χρ. ὅντες d | **16** ὡς d ἔως die übr. HSS | ἐτῶν ἐπτὰ bx τῶν ἐπτὰ χρόνων gy | **19** τὸν] τῶν by τὸν eg

36^c — S. 288, 23: Et cum Iudaei accepissent πρόσταξιν ut oīkodo- Michael
30 μήσαιεν τὸν ναὸν Hierosolymis et sacrificarent, [et] adduxerunt ἄσβεσ- τον, circiter tria milia μοδίων. ἄνεμος βίαιος in aëra sparsit eam et com- mota est terra [Folge nach Socrat. III 20, 10 ff].

31 f vgl. Agapius de Menbidj Histoire universelle, übersetzt von Vasilief Patrologia Orientalis VII fasc. 4 S. 581: »Pendant la nuit un vent violent s'éleva et détruisit tout ce qu'ils avaient construit; ensuite survint un grand tremblement de terre [s. ob. S. 96, 25 ff] et 22 villes furent englouties.«

Theophan. ἐγχειρήσει τοῦ ἔργου, πῦρ ἐξελθὸν τούτους κατέφλεξεν, καὶ οὕτως ἐπαύσαντο τῆς τόλμης.

37 — S. 52, 10: Ἐπὶ τούτοις ὥφθη ὁ θεῖος σταυρὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ φωτοειδὴς κυκλούμενος ὑπὸ στεφάνου φωτὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Γολγοθᾶ ἔως τοῦ ἀγίου ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν, λαμπρότερος μᾶλλον ἢ ἐπὶ Κωνσταντίου· αὐτομάτως τε τοῖς ἀπλώμασι τῶν θυσιαστηρίων καὶ βίβλοις καὶ ἄλλοις ἐσθήμασι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ ἐν ίματίοις οὐ μόνον Χριστιανῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἰουδαίων, ἐπεπόλαζε τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ σταυροῦ, οὐ μόνον ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ καὶ ἄλλαις 10 πόλεσιν. καὶ ὅν ἀναισχύντως ἡπίστουν Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ Ἑλληνες, εὑρίσκοντο τὰ ίματια αὐτῶν πεπληρωμένα σταυρῶν· ἐν τισι δὲ καὶ ἐμέλανιζον.

Ἰουλιανὸς πολλοὺς ἐν διαφόροις τόποις ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τε μαντείας καὶ χρηστήρια, ὅπως ἀν δόξῃ μετ' ἐπιτροπῆς τῶν δαιμόνων 15 ἐπὶ Πέρσας πόλεμον ἐγχειρεῖν. καὶ πολλῶν ἐκ διαφόρων κομισθέντων αὐτῷ χρησμῶν . . .

3—12 vgl. Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. V 4 u. 7. Sozomen. V 22, 12 f. Rufin H. E. X 40 [= Socrat. III 20, 14] — **5 f s. ob.** S. 221 — **13—16** vgl. Philostorg. VII 15 ob. S. 100, 9 f

20 **7** βίβλοισ b² βίλοισ d βήλοισ b² »mit richtiger Corr.« de Boor | **10** ὦν de Boor ὃν HSS οἱ oder ὁ oder εἱ Classen | **10/11** ηύρισκοντο b εύρισκον gxy | **11** ἔαντῶν egm | **13** nach Ἰουλιανὸς + δὲ gxy | εἰς διαφόρουσ τόπουσ c | εἴς] οἵσ b | **14** μετ' ἐπιτρόπων γ

Michael **37^a** — S. 289, 6: Propter aedificationem templi σημεῖον τοῦ σταυροῦ 25 ἐν omnibus ίματίοις aspiciebatur Iudeorum et paganorum et Christianorum et οὐ Hierosolymis μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Antiochiae et in regionibus circa eas (*nämlich*. urbes).

”Ωφθη δὲ ὁ σταυρός, cui erat στέφανος φωτός, ἀπὸ τοῦ Γολγοθᾶ ἔως τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν. et pulchrior fuit et λαμπρότερος 30 μᾶλλον ἢ illa <crux> quae diebus (= ἐπὶ) Coſt magni visa est (= ὥφθη).

38 — S. 53, 1: Υπερόριος γὰρ (näml. ὁ Ἰουλιανὸς) θείᾳ δίκῃ ἀνηρέθη. Theophan.
 τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5855), βασιλεύσας ἔτη β' μῆνας θ', κατὰ τὴν
 Περσικὴν θεόκταντος γέγονε [τῇ κεῖται τοῦ Ἰαννουαρίου μηνὸς] ἴν-
 δικιτῶνος ἔκτης [ἐτῶν ὑπάρχων λα']. Folge viell. desselben Ursprungs.

5 39 — S. 53, 24: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5856) Ἰουβιανὸς . . . βασιλεὺς
 Ῥωμαίων . . . ἀνηγορεύθη ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τόπῳ τῆς Περσῶν γῆς, ἐν ᾧ
 ὁ παραβάτης ἀνηρέθη. καὶ μετὰ μίαν συμβολὴν πολέμου εἰρήνη ὡς

3/4 τῇ κεῖται τοῦ Ἰαννουαρίου (sic wie Exc. Bar. st. Ἰουνίου, vgl. Socrat. III 21,
 17f) μηνὸς u. ἐτῶν ὑπάρχων λα' = Exc. Tripart. | 5 ιωβιανὸς d

10 38a — S. 104, 6: Et anno sescentesimo septuagesimo quarto descendit Iulianus impurus in terram Chaldaeorum, in <regionem> Bēt Aramayē <dictam>, ubi eius ruina accidit per manus Romanorum. eodem tempore iratus est dominus adversus civitates paganorum. et Iudeorum et Samaritanorum et falsarum doctrinarum in regione 15 australi, quae se participes effecerant insaniae Iuliani pagani. et processit furor a domino coepitque in ruinas dare civitates immundas et paganas super earum incolas, quia eas polluerant sanguine quem iniuste in eis effuderunt; et coepit destruere civitates viginti unam quarum aliae eversae sunt, aliae ruerunt, aliae substiterunt, mense Ḥyār anni sescentesimi septuagesimi quarti. [et die vicesimo septimo huius mensis <occisus est Iulianus>].

39a — Ebd. Folge: Mense Ḥazīran anni sescentesimi septuagesimi quarti die Veneris ad ripam fluminis magni Tigridis, ad latus boreale Kaukabā et Ctesiphontis in regione dicta Bēt Aramayē, sumpsit Iobininus 25 (sic) coronam magnam imperii Romanorum, et ipse fecit pacem et concordiam, et hostilia sedavit inter utrumque regnum validum Romanorum et Persarum. ut autem esset pax inter eos et liberaret Romanos ex angustis quibus premebantur, dedit Persis universam regionem ad orientam Nisibis, quosdam e pagis quibus circumdatur <civitas> et 30 Armeniam universam cum locis pertinentibus ad ipsam Armeniam, et exulavit Nisibis mense Āb anni sescentesimi septuagesimi quarti in regionem Edessenorum; et tradita est Persis Nisibis vacua quidem incolis suis.

10 ff vgl. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2379 [zum Teil = Ruf. Fest. 28] —
 15 u. **17 f** vgl. ob. S. 227 ff — **15 ff** vgl. Gedichte des Ephräm übersetzt
 35 von Bickell Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol. 1878 II S. 354 — **18 f** vgl. ob. S. 235,
 35 f — **24—32** vgl. Philostorg. VIII 1 — **32** vgl. Michael 290, 15

39b — a. Abr. 2380: Iovianus rerum necessitate compulsus Nisibin (nisibi AB) et magnam Mesopotamiae partem Sapori Persarum regi tradidit.

Hier. Chron.

Theophan. ἀπὸ θεοῦ συμφώνως ἀνεβοήθη ὑπό τε Ῥωμαίων καὶ Περσῶν καὶ ώρισθη ἔτη λ'.

40 — S. 53, 33: Νόμους δὲ γενικοὺς κατέπεμψεν (näml. ὁ Ἰουβιανὸς)

ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰς πᾶσαν γῆν Ῥωμαίων, τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ μακαρίου

5 Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ μεγάλου κατάστασιν καὶ τιμὴν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ
ἀποδιδούς.

41 — S. 54, 10: 'Ο δὲ αὐτοκράτωρ Ἰουβιανὸς ἐπέβη τῇ Ἀντιοχέων
μηνὶ Ὑπερβερεταίῳ. καὶ ἐγεννήθη παιδίον ἔξω τῆς πύλης τῆς πόλεως
ἐπὶ τὸ λεγόμενον Τρίπυλον ἀγροίκῳ κηπωρῷ θῆλυ ἐπταμηναῖον ἔχον

10 κεφαλὰς δύο διωρισμένας, ἐκάστη τὸ πλάσμα τετελειωμένον, ὡς ἀπὸ
τοῦ τραχήλου ἐκάστης κεφαλῆς κεχωρισμένης. νεκρὸν δὲ τοῦτο ἐτέχθη
μηνὶ Διώ, ὃ ἐστι Νοέμβριος. ἔξωρμησεν Ἰουβιανὸς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀντιοχέων
ἐπὶ Κωνσταντινούπολιν καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐν Ἀγκύρᾳ τῆς Γαλατίας ὕπατος
προῆλθε σὺν τῷ αὐτοῦ νιῷ Ὁὐαρωνιανῷ ἐπιφανέντα τὸν αὐτὸν

15 ἀναγορεύσας ἄνευ τοῦ ἐνδύσαι αὐτῷ πορφύραν. τῷ δ' αὐτῷ ἔτει
(a. m. 5856) βασιλεύσας μῆνας θ' ἡμέρας ιε' Ἰουβιανὸς ὁ Χριστιανι-
κώτατος ἐν Δαδασθάνοις, χωρίῳ τῆς Βιθυνίας, γενόμενος ἐτελεύτησεν·
καὶ ἀνηγορεύθη βασιλεὺς Οὐαλεντινιανὸς Αὔγουστος ἔτη ια' ὑπὸ τοῦ
στρατοπέδου.

20 42 — S. 55, 1: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5857) Οὐαλεντινιανὸς ὁ Αὔ-
γουστος Γρατιανὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ νιὸν Αὔγουστον ἀνηγόρευσεν, κοινωνὸν
τῆς βασιλείας ὁμοῦ καὶ ὕπατον.

12—22 vgl. Philostorg. VIII 8. Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2380 [vgl. Eutrop. X 18]
u. 2383. Chronic. min. ed. Mommsen I 240 f a. 364 u. 367

25 **14** οὐρωνιανῷ γ ἀρωνιανῷ dy | ἐπιφανέστατον Philostorg. ob. S. 107, 18

Chron. M. 40^a — Ebd. Folge: Credidit Iobininus in dominum ex toto corde
suo et cooperat facere bonum et pulchrum coram domino et ambulare
in viis Davidis et in fide Ezechiae et in operibus Iosiae; et requiem
ei dedit dominus ut merebatur gratiamque ei retribuit bonorum eius
30 operum. inceperat agere et ipse volens sibi comparare nomen in
aeternum et tribuere honorem universo populo dei, Christianis nempe;
et iussit ut thesaurus ecclesiarum redderetur, quem abstulerat Julianus
in insania sua, et a tributo eius liberavit omnes Christianos.

27 f vgl. II Kön. 22, 2. Sir. 49, 4 — **31 ff** vgl. Philostorg. VIII 5

Michael 41^a — S. 290, 21: Pervenit Antiochiam et inde Ancyram Galatiae et
36 ibi filium suum Ouarianum (*sic*) fecit ὕπατον (*im Syr.*) et multum
ἀνηγόρευσεν eum ἄνευ τοῦ ἐνδύσαι αὐτῷ πορφύραν.

42^a — S. 292, 15: Et τὸν ἑαυτοῦ νιὸν Gratianum Αὔγουστον (*im Syr.*)
ἀνηγόρευσεν καὶ ὕπατον (*ὕπατον im Syr.*) fecit.

43 — S. 56, 9: Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ χρόνῳ (a. m. 5859) διῆγεν Οὐάλης ὁ Theophan. βασιλεὺς ἐν Μαρκιανούπολει τῆς Μυσίας. σεισμὸς δὲ μέγας γέγονε κοθ' ὅλης τῆς γῆς ἐν τῇ η' ἵνδικτιώνι ἐν νυκτί, ὡς καὶ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ πλοῖα προσωριμισμένα τῷ αἰγιαλῷ ἐπαρθῆναι εἰς ὕψος καὶ 5 ὑπερβῆναι τὰς ὑψηλὰς οἰκοδομὰς καὶ τὰ τείχη καὶ μετατεθῆναι ἔνδον εἰς τὰς αὐλάς καὶ τὰ δώματα τὰ πλοῖα· ὑπαναχωρησάσης δὲ τῆς θαλάσσης, ἔμειναν ἐπὶ ξηρᾶς. οἱ δὲ λαοὶ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως φυγόντες διὰ τὸν σεισμόν, θεωρήσαντες τὰ πλοῖα ἐπὶ τῆς ξηρᾶς εἰς ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ἐν τοῖς πλοίοις φορτίων ἐπῆλθον· καὶ ἐπιστρέψαν τὸ ὄδωρ 10 πάντας ἐκάλυψεν. ἄλλους δὲ ναυτικοὺς διηγήσασθαι ὡς κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν ὥραν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Ἀδρία πλέοντες καταληφθῆναι, ἔξαίφνης δὲ ἐν τῷ πελάγει εἰς τὸ ἔδαφος καθίσαι τὸ πλοῖον· καὶ μετὰ βραχὺ πάλιν ἐπανελθεῖν τὸ ὄδωρ, καὶ οὕτω πλεῦσαι.

1 f u. unt. S. 240, 1 f vgl. Philostorg. IX 7 ob. S. 118, 29 f — **2—13** vgl. Vita 15 Athanas. 29 PG 25, CCX. Ammian. Marcellin. XXVI 10, 15—19. Socrat. IV 3, 4u.? Sozomen. VI 2, 14 [mit der Anm. von Val.]. Joh. von Nikiu 82 S. 445. Chronic. min. ed. Mommsen I 240 a. 365

3 η' de Boor i' bgy δεκάτη d | **6** τὰ¹ > b | **7** ἔμεινεν ef | **11** πλέοντας b | **13** ἐπελθεῖν b

20 43^a — S. 292, 23: Ille δὲ Valens ierat in Aegyptum et cum Michael esset Marcianopoli, γέγονε σεισμὸς cui a diebus mundi non evenerat similis. agitatum est mare et proiecit πλοῖα super τὰ τείχη urbis et ceciderunt ἔνδον εἰς τὰς αὐλάς. et reliquit ἡ θάλασσα locum suum et apparuit ξηρὰ et ἔμειναν πλοῖα soluta. et ὁ λαὸς cucurrit εἰς ἀρπαγὴν 25 et ἐπέστρεψε mare super eos et ἐκάλυψε eos. διηγήσαντο δὲ ναυτικοὶ etiam in Hadriatico (*im Syr. Adrios*) mari rursus evenisse haec. et commotum est mare et incessit in ξηρὰν milia multa et abscondit pagos et incolas eorum. et totum ἔδαφος apparuit siccum et cadebant τὰ πλοῖα in terram et homines intra ea in stupore <erant>. et ἔξαίφνης πάλιν 30 mare ἐπανῆλθε paulatim (*wahrscheinlich = κατὰ βροχύ*). et sublatae sunt naves super mare et fluctuabant, neque ullo modo laesi sunt homines.

21—25 auch bei Chron. CE übersetzt von Nau, Revue Orient Chrétien 1908 S. 440

43^b — a. Abr. 2382: Terrae motu per totum orbem facto, [mare litus egreditur = *Chron. min. ed. Mommsen I 240 a. 365; vgl. Hieronym. Vita Hilarion. 40]*] et Siciliae multarumque insularum urbes innumerabiles populos oppressere.

Theophan. 44 — S. 57, 14: Ἐν Μαρκιανούπόλει δὲ (a. m. 5860) Οὐάλης στρατέων κατὰ Γότθων παρεχείμαζεν ἐκεῖ.

45 — S. 59, 32: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5865) Οὐάλεντος ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ διάγοντος εύρεθησάν τινες ἐπιβουλὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ μελετῶντες, καὶ 5 ἀνηρέθησαν στῖφος ἀσεβῶν· διὰ γὰρ μαντειῶν καὶ θυσιῶν τὴν συσκευὴν κατειργάζοντο.

46 — S. 62, 2: . . . θνήσκει (näml. ὁ Οὐαλεντινιανὸς) μηνὶ Δίῳ ιζ' 10 ίνδικτιῶνος γ'. Γρατιανοῦ δέ, τοῦ νιὸν αὐτοῦ, μὴ εὑρεθέντος ἐκεῖσε, καὶ Οὐάλεντος ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ διάγοντος, τὸ εὑρεθὲν στρατόπεδον ἐν 15 τῷ τόπῳ ἐν φέτελεύησεν Οὐαλεντινιανὸς ὁ μέγας, Οὐαλεντινιανόν, τὸν νιὸν αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἐτῶν δ' ἀνηγόρευσαν Αὔγουστον, συμπαρούσης καὶ Ἰουστίνης, τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῇ Πανονίᾳ. τοῦτο μαθὼν Γρατιανὸς τὸν μὲν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ εἶχε συμβασιλεύοντα μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ, τοὺς δὲ ἀναγορεύσαντας διαφόροις τρόποις ἐτιμωρήσατο διὰ τὸ παρὰ 15 γνώμην αὐτοῦ τοῦτο γενέσθαι.

47 — S. 64, 34: Τούτῳ τῷ ἔτει (a. m. 5870) οἱ Γότθοι . . . ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὴν γῆν τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἡρήμωσαν πολλὰς ἐπαρχίας, Σκυθίαν, Μυσίαν, Θράκην, Μακεδονίαν, καὶ Ἀχαΐαν, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἑλλάδα, περὶ τὰς εἴκοσιν ἐπαρχίας. ἐθεάθησαν δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐν

20 3—6 vgl. Philostorg. IX 15 — 7—15 vgl. ebd. IX 16

2 παρεχείμασεν f | 4 τινες > b | 7 ιζ'] ζ' bf | 8 γ'] ob δ'? de Boor; vgl. Chron. P. a. 375 | 11 ἀνηγόρευσεν gy | 17 κυθίαν b σκιθίαν em | 19 περὶ τῆς κ' ἐπαρχίας b

Michael 46^a — S. 293, 29: Et cum Valentinianus mortuus esset et non
25 praesens esset Gratianus, ὁ νιὸς αὐτοῦ prior, praesente δὲ Iustina, con-
venerunt τὰ στρατόπεδα et regem fecerunt Valentinianum minorem,
cum esset δ' ἐτῶν.

47^a — S. 294, 21: Et ἐν eodem χρόνῳ ἐθεάθησαν ἐν ἀέρι ἄνδρες
intrā νεφέλην ἐσχηματισμένοι ἔνοπλοι (wörtl. ἐν σχήμασι ἐνόπλων).
30 et ἐγεννήθη Antiochiae παιδίον ἔχον ἔνα ὄφθαλμὸν ἐν μέσῳ τῷ
μετώπῳ et τέσσαρας χεῖρας καὶ τέσσαρας πόδας καὶ πώγωνα. et hoc
tempore ἐξῆλθον Gothi εἰς τὴν γῆν Romanorum καὶ ἡρήμωσαν

Chron. CE 46^b — S. 97, 17: Cum δὲ mortuus esset, non praesens erat Gratianus
ὁ νιὸς αὐτοῦ et frater eius Valens Antiochiae διῆγε. τὰ δὲ στρατόπεδα
35 ἀνηγόρευσαν τὸν νιὸν αὐτοῦ Valentinianum regem cum esset δ'
ἐτῶν, propterea quod παρῆν ἡ μῆτηρ αὐτοῦ Iustina.

τῷ ἀέρι [ἐν] ταῖς νεφέλαις ἐσχηματισμένοι ἄνδρες ἔνοπλοι. ἐγεννήθη Theophan.

δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ παιδίον ἐντελῆ μὲν τὰ ἄλλα μέρη, ὁφθαλμὸν
δὲ ἔνα ἔχον ἐν μέσῳ τῷ μετώπῳ, χεῖρας δὲ τέσσαρας καὶ πόδας
τέσσαρας καὶ πώγωνα.

5 Οὐάλης δὲ διάγων ἐν τῇ Ἀντιοχέων καὶ μαθὼν περὶ τῶν Τόγθων
ἥλθεν ἐπὶ Κωνσταντινούπολιν.

48 — S. 65, 18: Τοῦτον (näml. τὸν Οὐάλεντα) δὲ καταλαβόντες οἱ
βάρβαροι καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἀνάψαντες, ἀγνοοῦντες τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ πάντας
κατέκαυσαν.

10 1—4 vgl. Philostorg. X 11 ob. S. 130, 29 f — 7 ff vgl. ebd. IX 17 ob. S. 124, 7ff.
Hier. Chron. a. Abr. 2395

1 ἐν > b | **2** καὶ > g

ἐπαρχίας (*im Syr.*) πολλὰς et Scythiam et Mysiam et Thraciam et Mace-
doniam et Achaiam καὶ πᾶσαν Hellada. Michael

15 48^a — S. 294, 31: ἔφυγεν in ἀγρὸν (*im Syr.*) quendam, et cum
οἱ βάρβαροι circumdedisset eum, se occultavit in quadam corte et κατέ-
κρυψεν ἑαυτὸν ἐν χόρτῳ. et cum non invenissent eum, iniecerunt πῦρ
toti ἀγρῷ et combustus est etiam ille impius et iit etiam in ignem
gehennae.

20 48^b — S. 97, 25: Et ἔφυγεν et intravit in ἀγρὸν (*im Syr.*) quendam
et cum insecuri essent eum οἱ βάρβαροι et circumdedisset τὸν ἀγρὸν,
intravit in acervum paleae et κατέκρυψεν ἑαυτὸν ἐν χόρτῳ. οἱ δὲ βάρ-
βαροι cum non invenisent eum, intulerunt ignem toti ἀγρῷ, et ita suffo-
catus est in fumo et fuit illi finis malus. Chron. SOE.

INDEX

- Aetius, 130, 136, 156–159, 164, 167
Arian “controversy”
And the Council of
Constantinople, 119
Athanasius and, 58
Asterius and, 137
Constantine and, 139–141
Defined by church history, 2, 3,
6, 9, 170
Eusebius of Caesarea and, 51–52,
55
Influence on church history, 25,
91–92, 97–98, 122
Influence on imperial power,
97–100, 101–102, 145
Used as a measure of theological/
historical development, 1, 5, 6,
131
- Arius, 51–52, 55, 58, 91–92, 97–98,
187
- Asterius, 137, 138
- Athanasius, 2, 9, 52–53, 57–60, 65,
73, 104–114, 132, 141, 141–145,
147, 166
- Basil of Caesarea, 115–117
- Chronicler, The, 62–79, 132, 142, 166
- Church Councils
Antioch, 31–35, 148
Paul of Samosata, 31–35, 148
Constantinople, 3, 13–14, 99,
119, 132
And Philostorgius, 132
Influence on theology, 13, 14
- Jerusalem, 58, 59, 141, 142
Athanasius deposed, 141, 142
- Nicea, 3, 4, 17, 52–53, 68, 70
Athanasius and Constantine,
52–53
- Eusebius of Nicomedia, 67–68,
99–100, 136
- Tyre, 18, 59, 100
- Church Historians
And the Roman emperors, 92–93,
132–133, 152
- Constantine, 47–48, 52, 54,
67–68
- Constantius, 64, 73–79
- Gratian, 150–151, 152
- Jovian, 150
- Julian, 111–112, 148–150
- Theodosius I, 18, 102–104,
151–152
Theodosian Code, The, 151
- Valens, 111, 112, 113, 150
And Basil of Caesarea,
118–119
- Valentinian, 111
- Athanasius
And Constans, 146
And Constantine, 14
And Constantius, 143, 144, 146
And the Council of Nicea, 132
And Didymus the blind monk,
113–114
As chief source defining Arian
“heresy”, 57–58, 60, 65
As church historian, 61, 72,
166, 169
Condemned and exiled, 59,
101, 141
Doctrinal defense, 2
- Influence on
Ascetism, 9
Church history, 59, 64, 81, 85
Theology, 105–106
- Chronicler, the, 11, 57
As church historian, 73, 132, 166
Chronicon Paschale, The, 62–79
- On
Constantine, 142
Constantius, 70
Eusebius of Nicomedia, 68–69
Great Persecution, the, 65
- Epiphanius of Salamis
As commentator on “heresy”,
83–85
As church historian, 82, 83, 84
On Origen, 24
- Eusebius of Caesarea, 7, 19–21
And Biblical images of the
church, 39–47, 54

- And the Book of Hebrews, 41
 And the Great Persecution, 38, 49
 As church historian, 10–11, 16, 18, 22, 25, 30, 31, 33, 48–50, 55–56
Ecclesiastical History, 10, 16–17, 21, 26–27
 Book X, 37,
 —as re-evaluation of books VI–VIII, 16, 54
 Importance to the development of church history, 18–19, 56
 Influenced by Origen, 35–37, 43–47
Life of Constantine, The, 16–17
Martyrs of Palestine, The, 38
 Modern critique of, 35–37
 Novatius and the Decian Persecution, 29–30
Panegyrical Oration, The, 41, 46–47
 Gelasius, 62
 Philostorgius
 As church historian, 122, 125–130, 138, 167
 And the Nicene Creed, 70
 And Theophilus “the Indian”, 143, 144, 146
 Contrasted with Rufinus, 129, 131
 Critique of Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History*, 130
 Interpretation of church history, 127, 129
 Labeled “Arian”, 65, 73–74, 178
 New critiques of, 128
 On Aetius, 154–160
 Athanasius, 141–142, 145, 147
 Eunomius, 155, 159–160
 Council of Nicea, 134
 On the Roman Emperors
 Constantine, 139–141
 Constantine and Athanasius, 141–142, 146
 Constantius, 141, 142–145, 147–148
 Gratian, 150–151
 Jovian, 150
 Julian, 148–150
 Theodosius, 151–152
 Valens, 150
 Theology, 135, 137, 142, 162–163
 Rufinus, 11–12
 As church historian, 81, 86–88, 90, 104, 109
 As translator, 81, 86–87, 91
 And
 Athanasius, 104–112, 122
 Didymus the blind monk, 113–114
 Helena, Constantine the Great’s mother, 94–96
 Lucius of Alexandria, 112–113
 Monasticism 112–121; The Cappadocians, 115–121
 Chief source on Nicene historiography, 81, 121–122
 Critique(s) of as church historian, 88–90
 Influence on later church historians, 122–123
 Interpretation of his work, 122
 Linguistic significance, 168
 On heresy, 94, 99
 On the Roman emperors, 94
 Constantine, 92–101
 Constantius, 98–101
 Jovian, 102–103
 Julian, 110
 Socrates, 15, 17, 72–73
 Critique of Eusebius, 20
 Influenced by Rufinus, 169
 Sozomen, 15, 18
 Influenced by Rufinus, 169
 On Athanasius, 108–109, 141
 On Lucian the Martyr, 137–138
 Theodoret, 17, 20
 Theological defense of Alexandrian orthodoxy, 20
 Church History
 Influence on communal identity, 8, 9, 11–13, 163
 Influence on diversity, 6
 Influences on, 12, 20–21, 22, 24, 35, 57, 61, 64–65, 73, 78–79, 87, 112–113, 130–131
 Methodologies, 38, 167–168
 Problems with, 14, 63, 126
 Role in the development of Christianity, 126, 165
 Constantine, 12, 47–48, 52–54, 67–68, 92–101, 139–142, 146

- Constantius, 64, 73–79, 98–101, 141, 142–145, 147–148
 Cyprian, 7–8
- Epiphanius of Salamis, 24, 82–85
 Eunomius, 134, 155, 157, 159–162
 Eusebius of Caesarea, 7, 10–11, 16, 18–22, 25, 30–31, 33, 35–50, 54–56, 165
 Eusebius of Nicomedia, 67–69, 99, 100, 136
- Gelasius, 62
 Gratian, 150–151
 Gregory of Nazianzus, 117–119
 Gregory of Nyssa, 119–121, 154
- Helena, mother of Constantine, 94–96
- Jovian, 150
 Julian, 110–112, 148–150
- Leontius, Bishop of Antioch, 69–70, 157, 158
 Lucian the Martyr, 69–70
 And Philostorgius, 136, 167
 As focus of *The Chronicon Paschale*, 66–68, 79
 Compared with other church heroes/martyrs, 110
 Disciple of Asterius, 137, 138
 Influence on
 Arius, 59
 Church history, 73, 130–131, 132, 133 (notes), 163
 Doctrine, 8, 136, 156–157
 Leontius, Bishop of Antioch, 69–70, 157, 158
- Later disciples
 Aetius, 154, 156–159, 167
 Syntagma, 130
 Eunomius, 155, 167
 Apology and *Apology for the Apology*, 130
 Theophilus “the Indian”, 160–161, 167
 Theology, 130, 136, 138 (notes)
- Lucius, Bishop of Alexandria, 112–113
- Monasticism
 As influence on church history, 9, 12, 112
 The Cappadocians, 115–121, 122, 125
- Basil of Caesarea, 115–117
 Debating Eunomius, 160
 Gregory of Nazianzus, 117–118, 119
 Gregory of Nyssa, 119–121
 —And Actius, 154
 Lucian monastics, 161
 Rise of, 112–115, 117, 120, 122, 166–167
- Novatius, 29–30
- Origen, 27–31
 And the Cappadocians, 116
 As heretic/unorthodox, 23–24
 Biblical exegesis, 42–45
 Defenders of, 24, 27–29
 Doctrinal positions, 35, 45–46
 Influence on church history, 8
- Orthodoxy, 2,3
 And Athanasius, 59
 As doctrine, 4, 6–7, 12, 22
 Defined by Philostorgius, 14, 163
 Defined by Rufinus, 86
 Influenced by local tradition, 7–8
 Nicene orthodoxy in church history, 20, 168
 Non-Nicene, 70, 181, 153 (notes)
 Actius, 156, 161–162
 Eunomius, 161–162
 Theophilus “the Indian”, 161–162
 Orthodoxy or Heresy? 166, 167
 Problems with, 14
- Paul of Samosata, 31–35, 148
 Philostorgius, 6, 14, 65, 70, 73–74, 125–131, 135, 137–148
- Rufinus, 12, 15, 81, 86–88, 90, 92, 104–123, 168–169
- Socrates, 15, 17, 20, 72–73, 169
 Sozomen, 15, 18, 108–109, 137–138, 141, 169
- Tertullian, 7–8
 Theodoret, 17, 20
 Theodosius, 14, 18, 102–104, 151–152
 Theological Schools
 Alexandria, 8, 61, 166
 Christology, 20
 Cyprian and Tertullian as representatives, 7–8

- Heirs of Origen, 30–31
Antioch, 11
Caesarea, 8, 15, 110
And Eusebius as church historian, 35, 165
Theology
Aetius, 130, 136 (notes)
And Constantine, 140
And Julian the Emperor, 149
As influence on church history, 130, 133–138, 143–145, 147, 153–154, 161, 165, 169
Distinction between theology and history, 165, 170
Influences on, 13–14
Influence on imperial authority, 153
Problems with, 14
Theophilus “the Indian”, 143–144, 146, 160–161, 167
Trinity, 3–4, 131 (notes)
Valens, 111–113, 118–119, 150
Valentinian, 111